

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 23, 1987

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We know, O God, that with the trials and tensions of life come also the joys and hopes of living. We are grateful that in all the great moments of life, we can be supported by such a fellowship of good people that we need not face the concerns of today or tomorrow either alone or without the prayers and good wishes of others. For all those whose love and care is our support, we offer this word of thanksgiving. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 289, nays 101, answered "present" 1, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

YEAS—289

Ackerman	Bonker	Collins
Akaka	Borski	Combest
Alexander	Bosco	Conte
Anderson	Boucher	Conyers
Andrews	Boxer	Cooper
Annuzio	Brennan	Coyne
Anthony	Brooks	Crockett
Archer	Broomfield	Darden
Aspin	Brown (CA)	Davis (MI)
AuCoin	Bruce	de la Garza
Baker	Bryant	DeFazio
Barnard	Bustamante	Dellums
Bartlett	Byron	Derrick
Bateman	Callahan	DeWine
Bates	Campbell	Dicks
Beilenson	Cardin	Dixon
Bennett	Carper	Dorgan (ND)
Bereuter	Carr	Dornan (CA)
Berman	Chapman	Dowdy
Bevill	Chappell	Downey
Bilbray	Clarke	Duncan
Boggs	Coeilho	Durbin
Boland	Coleman (TX)	Dwyer

Dyson	Kostmayer	Regula	Dreier	Lloyd	Sikorski
Early	LaFalce	Rhodes	Edwards (OK)	Lott	Skeen
Eckart	Lancaster	Richardson	Emerson	Lowery (CA)	Slaughter (VA)
Edwards (CA)	Lantos	Rinaldo	Fields	Mack	Smith, Denny
Erdreich	Leath (TX)	Ritter	Gallagher	Madigan	(OR)
Espy	Lehman (CA)	Robinson	Gekas	Marlenee	Smith, Robert
Evans	Lehman (FL)	Roe	Gingrich	Martin (IL)	(NH)
Fascell	Lent	Roemer	Goodling	Martin (NY)	Smith, Robert
Fawell	Levin (MI)	Rose	Gregg	McCandless	(OR)
Fazio	Levine (CA)	Rostenkowski	Hansen	McGrath	Solomon
Feighan	Lewis (GA)	Rowland (CT)	Hasert	McMillan (NC)	Spence
Fish	Livingston	Rowland (GA)	Henry	Michel	Stokes
Flippo	Lowry (WA)	Roybal	Hiler	Miller (OH)	Stump
Florio	Lujan	Russo	Hopkins	Molinari	Sundquist
Foglietta	Lukens, Thomas	Salki	Hunter	Moorhead	Swindall
Foley	Lukens, Donald	Savage	Ireland	Parris	Tauke
Ford (MI)	MacKay	Sawyer	Jacobs	Pashayan	Thomas (CA)
Frank	Manton	Saxton	Kolbe	Penny	Upton
Frenzel	Markey	Scheuer	Konnyu	Pursell	Vucanovich
Frost	Martinez	Schneider	Kyl	Ridge	Walker
Gallo	Matsui	Schuetz	Lagomarsino	Roberts	Weber
Gaydos	Mavroules	Schulz	Latta	Rogers	Whittaker
Gejdenson	Mazzoli	Sharp	Leach (IA)	Roukema	Wolf
Gibbons	McCloskey	Shaw	Lewis (CA)	Schaefer	Young (AK)
Gilman	McCollum	Shumway	Lewis (FL)	Schroeder	Young (FL)
Glickman	McCurdy	Shuster	Lightfoot	Sensenbrenner	
Gonzalez	McDade	Sisisky			
Gordon	McEwen	Skelton			
Gradison	McHugh	Slattery			
Grandy	McMillen (MD)	Slaughter (NY)			
Grant	Meyers	Smith (FL)			
Gray (PA)	Mfume	Smith (IA)			
Green	Mica	Smith (NE)			
Guarini	Miller (CA)	Smith (NJ)			
Gunderson	Miller (WA)	Smith (TX)			
Hall (TX)	Mineta	Snowe			
Hamilton	Moakley	Solarz			
Hammerschmidt	Montgomery	Spratt			
Harris	Moody	St Germain			
Hatcher	Morella	Staggers			
Hawkins	Morrison (WA)	Stallings			
Hayes (IL)	Mrazek	Stark			
Hayes (LA)	Murphy	Stenholm			
Hefley	Murtha	Stratton			
Hefner	Myers	Studds			
Herger	Natcher	Sweeney			
Hertel	Neal	Synar			
Hochbrueckner	Nelson	Thomas (GA)			
Holloway	Nichols	Torres			
Horton	Nielson	Traficant			
Houghton	Nowak	Traxler			
Howard	Oakar	Udall			
Hoyer	Oberstar	Valentine			
Hubbard	Obey	Vander Jagt			
Huckaby	Olin	Vento			
Hughes	Ortiz	Visclosky			
Hutto	Owens (UT)	Volkmer			
Hyde	Oxley	Walgren			
Jeffords	Panetta	Watkins			
Jenkins	Patterson	Waxman			
Johnson (CT)	Pease	Weiss			
Johnson (SD)	Pelosi	Weldon			
Jones (NC)	Pepper	Wheat			
Jones (TN)	Perkins	Wilson			
Jontz	Petri	Wise			
Kanjorski	Pickett	Wolpe			
Kaptur	Pickle	Wortley			
Kasich	Porter	Wyden			
Kastenmeier	Price (IL)	Wylie			
Kennedy	Price (NC)	Yates			
Kennelly	Quillen	Yatron			
Kildee	Rahall				
Kleczka	Rangel				
Kolter	Ravenel				

NAYS—101

Armey	Burton	Courter
Ballenger	Chandler	Craig
Bentley	Cheney	Crane
Billakis	Clay	Dannemeyer
Billey	Clinger	Daub
Boehlert	Coats	Davis (IL)
Brown (CO)	Coble	DeLay
Buechner	Coleman (MO)	Dickinson
Bunning	Coughlin	DioGuardi

Dreier	Lloyd	Sikorski
Edwards (OK)	Lott	Skeen
Emerson	Lowery (CA)	Slaughter (VA)
Fields	Mack	Smith, Denny
Gallagher	Madigan	(OR)
Gekas	Marlenee	Smith, Robert
Gingrich	Martin (IL)	(NH)
Goodling	Martin (NY)	Smith, Robert
Gregg	McCandless	(OR)
Hansen	McGrath	Solomon
Hasert	McMillan (NC)	Spence
Henry	Michel	Stokes
Hiler	Miller (OH)	Stump
Hopkins	Molinari	Sundquist
Hunter	Moorhead	Swindall
Ireland	Parris	Tauke
Jacobs	Pashayan	Thomas (CA)
Kolbe	Penny	Upton
Konnyu	Pursell	Vucanovich
Kyl	Ridge	Walker
Lagomarsino	Roberts	Weber
Latta	Rogers	Whittaker
Leach (IA)	Roukema	Wolf
Lewis (CA)	Schaefer	Young (AK)
Lewis (FL)	Schroeder	Young (FL)
Lightfoot	Sensenbrenner	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Skaggs

NOT VOTING—42

Applegate	Ford (TN)	Packard
Atkins	Garcia	Ray
Badham	Gephardt	Rodino
Barton	Gray (IL)	Roth
Blaggi	Hall (OH)	Sabo
Boner (TN)	Inhofe	Schumer
Bonior (MI)	Kemp	Stangeland
Boulter	Leland	Tallon
Daniel	Lipinski	Tauzin
Dingell	Lungren	Taylor
Donnelly	Mollohan	Torricelli
Dymally	Morrison (CT)	Towns
English	Nagle	Whitten
Flake	Owens (NY)	Williams

□ 1215

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## JIM BEGGS TRIBUTE

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my great satisfaction in learning that the Justice Department dropped its indictment and all criminal fraud charges against Jim Beggs.

From all reports the Government never had a case against Beggs and, unconscionably, it took 19 months before Jim and the three codefendants were vindicated.

What we have here is justice gone awry. At the very least, the Justice Department should apologize to Jim Beggs and the codefendants. But, Mr. Speaker, no apology—no admission of a mistake—is going to make up for the 19 months of special hell that Jim Beggs and his family have had to live through.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

I have known Jim more than 20 years. I can say without hesitation that of the hundreds of witnesses that have appeared before the HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee—none ever came before that committee as well prepared—with such a thorough knowledge of the programs of his agency—and with such a straightforward and honest manner—as did Jim Beggs.

He has served his country well in the past. And I know in the future Jim Beggs will again be an invaluable public servant under this or any other administration.

Jim was fond of quoting Shakespeare and I am reminded of the opening lines of Richard III:

Now is the winter of our discontent made glorious summer by this sun of York.

Jim's long winter is over—and I know that I speak for many others in wishing Jim and his wife, Mary, a bright and rewarding future in the months and years ahead.

#### A TRIBUTE TO ODESSA BOY SCOUT TROOP NO. 98

(Mr. COMBEST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a group of young men from my district who embody the ideals of compassion, selflessness and courage.

Last month, these young men happened to be at the right place at the right time. On the way to a weekend camping trip on May 22, a group of 11 Boy Scouts and advisers from Odessa, TX, passed through the area of Saragosa, TX. Only minutes before, this small west Texas community had been hit by a devastating tornado. Only destruction and rubble remained for the people of Saragosa as this violent tornado ripped apart their town.

In the face of tragedy, these Boy Scouts, ranging from 12 to 15 years of age, unselfishly gave their blankets, sleeping bags, water, first aid kits and other camping equipment to the tornado victims and the rescuers. Furthermore, their excellent training enabled them to assist law enforcement officials in first aid, traffic control, and in comfort for the tornado victims.

The people of Odessa, the State of Texas, and our Nation can be proud of these fine young men. I, for one, am deeply moved and touched by their devotion and their ability to live and uphold the letter of the oath each scout took, to do their best, to do their duty to God and country, and to help other people at all times.

Odessa Boy Scout Troop No. 98 we commend you and we thank you for reminding us of an important lesson:

Our duty to love and help our fellow man.

#### RESOLUTION

Be it remembered, that on the 8th day of June, 1987, at a Regular Meeting of the Ector County Commissioners' Court, the following Resolution was offered and unanimously adopted, to-wit:

Whereas, the following young men and advisors are members of Boy Scout Troop 98, sponsored by the Odessa First Ward The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints:

Wayne Bonifay, age 14; Brad Hennagir, age 13; Mike Howell, age 15; Justin Roberts, age 12; Chris Vassiliou, age 13; Kerry Vore, age 12; Dwight Wallace, age 12; Shawn Wallace, age 13; Aaron Westmoreland, age 12; Don W. Bonifay, Assistant Scoutmaster; Doug Teague, Scoutmaster; and

Whereas, on the evening of May 22, 1987, these members of Troop 98 were traveling to a weekend campout and arrived on the scene of the Saragosa tornado disaster within minutes of the passage of the tornado; and

Whereas, upon encountering the disaster and destruction at Saragosa, these individuals promptly stopped to render aid and assistance at the site; and

Whereas, these Scouts willingly offered their blankets, sleepingbags, water, first aid kits and flashlights to assist the victims and the rescuers; and

Whereas, they performed first aid to the injured and offered comfort to the families and friends of the injured; and

Whereas, they assisted the Reeves County Sheriff's Department and the Texas Department of Public Safety with control of the crowds along Highway 17 and other duties when requested; and

Whereas, these Scouts exhibited several traits which are embodied in the "Scout Law", namely: "A Scout is . . . Helpful, Kind, Brave . . ." and most assuredly fulfilled the Scout Motto: "Be Prepared" on this occasion:

Now, therefore, we, the undersigned members of the Ector County Commissioners' Court do hereby express, on behalf of the Citizens of Ector County, our congratulations and commendations for courageous and exemplary action immediately following the Saragosa tornado.

□ 1230

#### SUPPORT URGED FOR BUDGET RESOLUTION

(Mr. WOLPE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes, the House will consider the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 93, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1988. I rise to urge support for the resolution.

First and foremost, the final House-Senate budget resolution mandates meaningful deficit reduction; it would reduce the deficit by over \$36 billion in the next fiscal year. In fact, the House-Senate compromise achieves almost twice as much permanent deficit reduction as the President's own budget proposal. Almost half of that reduction is achieved by painful but

critical savings in both defense and domestic programs; the remainder, as in the President's own budget, would come from new revenue. It is, in short, a pay as you go budget—it asserts clearly, and simply, that it is time to stop borrowing against our future. It is time to pay our bills.

Second, the budget conference renews our national commitment to our future—the future of our Nation and our people. It places priority on investments in health, education, community and economic development, job creation, and worker retraining.

Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate conferees have produced a budget worthy of our support. I urge my colleagues to join me in adopting the measure when it comes before us later today.

#### REFORM PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR RURAL HOSPITALS

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, as those of us from rural areas know, our communities simply cannot afford to lose our local hospitals. Not only would access to medical care be severely limited, but communities would suffer drastically because of the loss of such a large and vital employer.

Of 66 hospitals in my district, 50 have 50 beds or less. According to figures provided by the American Healthcare Institute and the Kansas Hospital Association, approximately 13 hospitals in my district serve an extremely high—70 percent—Medicare rate. The prospective payment system does not take into account the unique problems faced by these small hospitals.

In fact, the PPS unfairly penalizes rural hospitals by reimbursing them at a lower rate than their urban counterparts. Lower reimbursement combined with lower occupancy rates, higher operating costs, and higher Medicare dependency rates are crippling health care in rural States. Although urban hospitals may actually reap profits under the Medicare PPS system, small rural hospitals are continuing to struggle to keep their doors open.

For this reason, I have introduced legislation to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure that Medicare dependent, small, rural hospitals receive at least their reasonable costs for inpatient hospital services furnished under the Medicare Program. This much needed reasonable cost floor would apply only to highly Medicare-dependent rural hospitals, those with 70 percent Medicare business and 50 beds or less. The cost of this bill will be minimal as the qualifying threshold is high.



The legislation mandates that the Government will continue to reimburse qualifying hospitals under the prospective payment system but in addition will pay Medicare costs incurred over the PPS payment limits. Rural hospital costs often are higher than the present limit.

The PPS simply is not meeting the needs of small rural hospitals, and States like Kansas cannot afford further hospital closings. Congress created the PPS system in 1983 and now must make needed revisions and reforms to make the system work for rural hospitals. We cannot allow the quality of health care to decline in our rural areas because of a prejudiced and unfair Medicare payment system.

I ask your support and cosponsorship of this important legislation.

#### I HAVE A DREAM PROGRAM— HARTFORD

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, in these days of bad news, it is refreshing to be able to report some good news, some inspiring news.

Last Friday, a Hartford, CT, couple, Alan Ritter and Eileen Silverstein, promised 57 Hartford sixth graders that their college tuition would be paid in full. This action of generosity stemmed from the example of one Gene Lang of New York City who offered tuition, college-paid education for any child in PS 21 of East Harlem, if they finished high school.

Most of the children, all students at the Wish School in Hartford, are members of minority groups; many are Spanish speaking; the majority live in single-parent households at or near the poverty line. College might well have been an impossible dream for them had Mr. Ritter and Ms. Silverstein not founded I have a Dream—Hartford, setting aside \$260,000 to cover their tuition. As important as the financial contribution is, the commitment of this generous couple goes beyond writing the check to spending time over the coming years with the children as individuals, exploring possibilities and making plans.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to the participants in the I Have a Dream Program—Hartford, may all your dreams come true. And I say to Mr. Ritter and Ms. Silverstein, thank you for your generosity and your vision and your faith.

#### LET US NOT JUMP THE GUN ON APPROPRIATIONS

(Mr. BUECHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, after weeks of dawdling on the budget resolution, which delayed consideration of appropriations bills, the Democrat leadership has suddenly speeded up the appropriations process.

The trouble is that now the Democrat leadership is moving too fast. We are being asked to approve appropriations measures without knowing whether they conform to the budget ceilings.

The conference agreement on the budget resolution fails to specify the section 302(a) allocations on budget authority and outlays which constitute ceilings for the various standing committees, including Appropriations. The chairman of the Budget Committee has been given until July 1 to file these allocations.

In the meantime, however, the Appropriations Committee has moved four bills to the floor for consideration this week, including the Interior appropriations bill which comes up today, right after the budget resolution.

We have no way of knowing whether these bills stay within the allocations that will eventually be made.

Will we be adding to the deficit when we pass them? Who knows. It's like writing checks without knowing how much money is in your checking account.

If the Democrat leaders want to adhere to the budget process, and ensure deficit reduction, they should hold those appropriations bills until the proper budget allocations to both committees and subcommittees are made, or freeze these bills at last year's lower levels.

#### KUWAITI TANKER REFLAGGING—WHY?

(Mr. BRENNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent events surrounding the Persian Gulf leads many to question the Reagan administration's policy to reflag Kuwaiti tankers with our Stars and Stripes. It appears a major reason for this reflagging was an offer by the Soviet Union to lend their hammer and sickle to the Kuwaitis. I ask is this a sound basis for our Government to rush into the Persian Gulf with our flag practically for rent and placing our Nation in the middle of the Iran-Iraq war?

Our commitment to securing American interests in the Persian Gulf is a long one, which is not dependent on our distributing our flag to foreign vessels in an attempt to make them secure. The Persian Gulf remains open to world shipping and the Strait of Hormuz are not blocked. True, there are hostilities in the region, but the

flow of oil through the Gulf has not been seriously diminished. Our commitment to insuring the free flow of commerce in the Persian Gulf should not include rushing to make available our flag simply because the Soviets are offering their's.

Our Persian Gulf policy is muddled at best. We have sold arms to Iran, provided intelligence to the Iraqi's, and suffered casualties by an air attack by Iraq, and we are being drawn deeper into the war in the gulf by offering our flags to Kuwait. I urge the Reagan administration to reconsider this ill advised and dangerous reflagging offer and to continue seeking the cooperation of our allies.

#### A SHIP WITHOUT A RUDDER

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, today we are being asked to do something that not only violates our budget process, but the precepts of sound financial management.

We are being asked to approve a fiscal year 1988 appropriations bill for Interior, despite the fact that the conference agreement on the budget does not include section 302(a) allocations for the standing committees, including appropriations.

Because appropriations has no 302(a) allocation, it has not been able to make 302(b) allocations on budget authority and outlays to its subcommittees.

In other words, we have no way of knowing whether this Interior appropriations bill conforms to the budget or will do so when the allocations are made.

We are being asked to sail a ship without a rudder through some dangerous waters that, as you know, contain a Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit reduction shoal.

Passing appropriations bills without budget ceilings in place—three more appropriations measures are scheduled for floor action later this week—could increase the possibility of our running aground on that shoal.

The Democrat leadership should stick to the budget process. Let's wait until we get those ceilings in place or at least freeze appropriations at the lower fiscal year 1987 levels.

Democrat leaders should realize that if these appropriations bills exceed the section 302 allocations when they are finally made, it will be regarded as a signal that they do not intend to abide by the budget ceilings or even make an attempt to reach the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target.

Let's wait for the rudder to be placed on the budget ship.

### ELLIOTT ABRAMS PREDICTS CONGRESS WILL FORGET

(Mr. MOODY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post quotes Elliott Abrams as saying he will outlast congressional unhappiness with his having repeatedly deceived Congress on Contra aid.

One hundred and twenty-nine House Members have called for his resignation on the ground that the U.S. Constitution requires truthful testimony from the executive branch. On the same grounds, the chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has refused to even allow Secretary Abrams to testify before that subcommittee. But Secretary Abrams predicts that this congressional displeasure "will ultimately die."

"You guys will see as the weeks go by, here I am" is the direct quote in today's papers.

He is predicting that we will forget that he lied to Congress, that he knowingly distorted the sorry truth about the administration's actions in Central America, and that he did this repeatedly. Apparently he is expecting that our commitment to basic constitutional requirements is as weak as his.

### THE TIME FOR PRODUCT LIABILITY REFORM IS NOW

(Mr. WORTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, we can no longer ignore the problems created by the high costs and uncertainty associated with our product liability system. It is time for Federal reform of product liability law.

More and more companies are discontinuing or refusing to place new products on the market because of high liability costs. Industries such as aerospace, sporting goods and pharmaceuticals are particularly hurt by these high costs. The more American companies that are reluctant to introduce new products, the more doors open for foreign-made substitutes. It is hypocritical to speak of competitiveness and yet ignore this issue.

If our tort system is not reformed soon, more and more businesses will find it impossible to compete. The ones which will be hurt most will be the small businesses which constitute the lifeblood of our economy.

Legal doctrines like joint and several liability must be reformed. That doctrine holds each defendant responsible for the liability attributable to all defendants. Defendants who may be only 1 percent at fault are now liable

for 100 percent of the damages. This leads to increased litigation and the inclusion of many deep pocket defendants whose involvement is minimal, and who probably would not be a party to litigation but for their ability to pay for large judgments.

It is time to get back to the fault-based principles on which the system was founded. Liability should not be based on injuries that could not be anticipated, injuries which were caused by misuse or alteration of a product, or injuries where adequate warnings were given on the safe use of a product.

Citizens and insurers share a common goal. An innocent consumer has a right to be compensated fairly and promptly for injuries he or she has suffered. At the same time, the tremendous burden of excessive litigation, high insurance costs, and declining productivity caused by confusion and uncertainty in our tort system must be lifted from the shoulders of U.S. business.

The Federal Government must take the lead in developing a coherent product liability system. This is a national problem which deserves a national solution. The time for product liability reform has arrived.

### TODAY'S VOTE ON THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today we vote on the budget. We started with the President's version some time ago, but that was so bad Republicans are still on medication.

The truth is, Mr. President, there are no free lunches here. If you want more money for MX, you will have to raise it. If you want more money for a fancy laser umbrella, you will have to find the cash. Mr. President, from now on, if you want to dance, you are going to have to pay the band, and that is the way it should be.

While the House budget is far from perfect, it keeps America safe and retains vital domestic programs, and that is the bottom line. It continues to keep the deficit moving downward. The House budget today is the only plane in town unless Members of Congress want to continue the crash course of Air Force I, and that is exactly where it has been taking us with record deficits.

Let us look at the record. It is not going to be an easy vote today, but it is the best vote. This House today should pass the budget that has been promulgated by our committee, and I commend the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

### A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE FRED ASTAIRE

(Mr. DAUB asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, yesterday you could almost feel the sadness of the country at the passing of one of America's most well known and loved citizens, Fred Astaire.

Gene Kelley said that the history of dance began with Astaire. It could then be said that American dance was born in Omaha, NE, on May 10, 1899, and its name was Frederic Austerlitz.

This slender native of Omaha, NE, brought joy into the hearts of all who witnessed his grace. He will forever inspire generations of dancers all who will seek to imitate his moves.

When I was growing up, cool became a popular slang term used to describe the guy who could make the most difficult task look easy. Astaire made everything look easy; cool may have been created to describe Astaire.

□ 1245

### INTRODUCTION OF STEEL REVITALIZATION ACT

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, the manufacture of steel in the United States is an industry in crisis. Facing worldwide oversupply of steel, cost estimates for the modernization and streamlining of our domestic industry run to \$14 billion over the next 5 years—and this for an industry already struggling under \$8 billion in debt. The bankruptcies of major steel makers such as LTV and Wheeling-Pittsburgh point to the seriousness of the problem.

Today I am introducing legislation that will facilitate the restructuring of the U.S. steel industry. Global quotas will be put in place on a temporary basis and the right to import steel under that quota will be auctioned off. Revenues raised through the auctions will then be channeled to the industry through long-term, low-interest loans, conditional upon companies committing to modernize, permanently deal with overcapacity, and fully funding pension, health care, disability insurance, and retaining programs. Thus the industry will be able to restructure with no costs to the Federal Government, the threat of large outlays to steelworkers whose pensions are guaranteed by the Federal Government will be lessened, and the pressures for continuing protection of the industry will be relieved through these temporary measures.



I urge my colleagues to join me as cosponsors of this legislation.

#### OUR ENERGY CHOICES

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, recent events in the Persian Gulf have focused the Western World's attention on oil and our increasing dependence on unpredictable, foreign sources of energy. I find it extremely ironic that the very same commentators who constantly oppose production from domestic energy supplies such as hydro, nuclear, coal, and especially new sources in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge also oppose our efforts to protect the free flow of oil from the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, we can't have it both ways. If Members oppose the domestic production of energy then they must commit to protecting the energy supply lines from the Persian Gulf.

Ten years ago this week, the Prudhoe Bay oil field, which supplies over 20 percent of this Nation's oil production, came on line. It's important that this body thinks about how many more sailors would be needed to protect our energy supply if this Congress in 1973 had not had the courage to approve the construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline and production from Prudhoe Bay—projects which prove that energy production is compatible with the protection of the environment.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HON. ROBERT N.C. NIX, SR.

(Mr. FOGLIETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this country lost not only a former Member of Congress, but a pioneer; a man who joined distinguished service with quiet dignity.

Robert N.C. Nix, Sr., former Congressman from the Second District of Pennsylvania, whose father was born into slavery and whose son sits in the exalted position of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, passed away yesterday at the age of 88.

Robert N.C. Nix, Sr., was elected to the 85th Congress as the first black to be elected to Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, on May 20, 1958. He served until 1979.

Bob Nix's service in the U.S. House of Representatives was more than distinguished. He was cochairman of the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Committee from 1968 to 1978. He was chairman of the International Relations Committee's Subcommittee on International Development, where he

became a recognized authority on the Middle East and South Africa.

In 1977 Bob Nix was appointed chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. He tended to his duties as chairman with the same vigor that he had shown when elected almost 20 years before. In fact, seldom in the history of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee had so many days of hearings been held, had so much legislation been reported out, and so many oversight investigations pursued.

Bob Nix was a pioneer. He was born in an era when nothing came easy and he left his hometown of Orangeburg, SC, in search of education opportunities not available to blacks at that time in the South. He came to Philadelphia to attend the University of Pennsylvania School of Law. He was the first black to graduate from this institution, doing so with highest honors. He went on to become the first black elected to Congress from Pennsylvania.

Robert N.C. Nix, Sr., was a man of exceptional accomplishment and compassion. He was a man of great idealism, a man who gave much to his family, his community, his profession and to the U.S. House of Representatives. I am proud to have considered myself a friend of his, and I extend to his family my sincerest sympathy.

#### BUYING AMERICAN IS GOOD ECONOMIC AND SECURITY STRATEGY

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Toshiba-Kongsberg scandal focuses attention on the critical issue of U.S. defense policy: When the United States purchases overseas, it exports the technology to build the weaponry; and, when the United States exports its defense technology, that technology then resides overseas—with very little control, in fact, by the United States.

As a result of the duplicity by the Toshiba-Kongsberg consortium, United States submarine technology is now with the Soviets. Technology was the advantage the United States had over the superior numbers of the Red submarine fleet.

Silence in the water was our advantage.

No longer.

When you consider what has happened with Toshiba-Kongsberg, when you consider there is little or no quality control on the foreign fasteners purchased for their low price, when you consider foreigners pay no taxes to help offset our national debt, you wonder about our procurement policy.

DOD claims Congress has mandated that DOD buy the cheapest brand X, no matter where it is made.

That being the case, we must reexamine those procurement laws.

When DOD buys in this country, 42 percent of the purchase price goes to taxes at the Federal, State, and local levels; and, DOD can monitor security.

Buying American makes good economic and security sense.

#### MINORITY OFFERS NO BUDGET ALTERNATIVE

(Mr. FRANK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, we are going to choose today among three approaches to the budget. One is the Democratic budget. I am going to vote for it. It reflects the constraints that we face, so it is not what I would like it to be, but it is there. Then we have the President's budget. The President has talked a lot about his budget. It somehow slipped his mind that he sent us a budget with a deficit which he claimed was \$108 billion, but his own economic analysis shows to be more like \$140 billion.

That budget would further the process of cutting medical care for the elderly. It would further the process of cutting environmental protection. It would deny student loans to more people who need them, so that we can increase military spending.

I think that those choices are wrong, and I think when we reject them, we will be reflecting what the American public wants.

But there is another option. It is the option of our Republican colleagues: that is, to do nothing whatsoever. There are tough choices to be made, and when the tough choices have to be made, our Republican colleagues resolutely will make none of them. They have offered no budget, they voted against the President's budget by a great majority, they will vote against the Democratic budget; they prefer a flight from reality. Far better to decry the tough situation then to try to make some serious efforts.

We will be choosing between two existing alternatives. We have the President's budget, to pump up military spending and cut medical care for the elderly, to cut student loans, and to cut environmental protection, or a Democratic budget which faces the tough choices and makes them with some pain, but which at least makes them.

I am glad that our Republican colleagues intend to be here for the budget; it will be nice to have them here. I guess that we should be glad that they did not decide just to take the whole week off and not even be here, but their failure ever at any

point in the process even to offer an alternative is a good definition of irresponsibility, and it shows once again that they have learned how to be the minority very, very well.

#### HOUSE FLOOR SCHEDULING

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Massachusetts talked about irresponsibility. I would urge all of my colleagues to read pages 44 and 45 of Newsweek this week about irresponsibility, about the scheduling of the House, about what factors go into deciding what is brought up on the floor. As I understand the rules of the House, it would be inappropriate to put this particular article from Newsweek in the RECORD because it suggests some things which would be inappropriate to discuss under the rules of the House.

□ 1255

Therefore, we will work with the Parliamentarian to find out ways in which Members of the House can learn about what Newsweek is saying about the leadership of the House, since it is useful for the House to confront responsibly, as my friend from Massachusetts emphasized, to confront responsibly how scheduling decisions are made and exactly what interests are at stake.

#### RESPONSIBLE ACTION ON THE BUDGET

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the leadership of this House has responded responsibly. The leadership of this House has made some tough decisions, and we are going to have to vote on it today. It is called a budget.

The President sent a budget to the House. The majority of Democrats voted against it. You would expect that, but the overwhelming majority of Republicans also voted against that budget, as they did in the U.S. Senate.

My friends, we have a budget before us which reflects reality. It is a result of political and economic reality which the administration, unfortunately, fails to understand, and some indeed on the other side of the aisle fail to understand.

It is time today to confront tough decisions. It is time today to do what we were elected to do: Set priorities, make tough decisions, move forward in an imperfect world. It is not a time to play let's pretend. It is a time for realism and responsibility, it is a time today to adopt the budget resolution.

Let us follow the leadership that has made tough decisions and urged us to act. Let us adopt this budget resolution and move on on behalf of all America.

#### EXTENDING APPRECIATION TO APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEMBERS

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper to give credit where credit is due and on this occasion I want to personally extend my appreciation to my colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee, in general, and to my friends TOM BEVILL and JOHN MYERS, in particular, for their untiring efforts in bringing the important Gallipolis Locks and Dam project to reality.

Thanks to the leadership of these outstanding Members, funding for first year construction to replace the most dangerous navigational facility on the Ohio River has been included in the energy and water appropriations bill. Thanks to the collective efforts of all those who have supported this worthwhile project over the years, long-term jobs, in a region of great need, will be realized this fall as work gets underway on this multimillion-dollar complex which is so essential to the movement of raw products from Pittsburgh to New Orleans.

Those who will benefit from the project will not have the chance to say thanks to Mr. MYERS and Mr. BEVILL. But let me assure both men and the committee as a whole that they have made a difference where and when it means the most.

#### TRIBUTE TO MAYOR HERB HAYS

(Mr. HUBBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, the popular 58-year-old mayor of Hopkinsville, KY, Herbert G. Hays, finally lost a determined, lengthy battle against cancer last Thursday afternoon, June 18.

This Member of Congress is saddened because I have lost a good friend.

Can Democrats and Republicans work together? Well, we have just heard some heated exchanges between Republicans and Democrats here in the House Chamber. But my friend Herb Hays, the No. 1 Republican in western Kentucky, and I enjoyed working together for progress in our area of this great country.

Herb Hays was First Congressional District chairman for President Rea-

gan's 1980 and 1984 Kentucky organizations. He served two terms as chairman of the Republican Party for the First Congressional District of Kentucky.

Herb Hays was the first Republican ever elected mayor of Hopkinsville. He was sworn in January 1 last year. So he served as mayor 1 year, 5 months, and 18 days, much of the time with terminal cancer. Herb Hays definitely gave the job of being mayor of Hopkinsville, KY, everything he had.

Many major accomplishments occurred during the Hays administration. His dream, his goal was to promote Hopkinsville.

I want to say now the same words I said Saturday at Mayor Hays' funeral to his lovely wife Marilyn and three children: "Thank God for people of vision and courage such as the beloved Mayor Herb Hays."

My wife Carol and I extend to his wife Marilyn, his son Jack Hays, his daughters Peg Crutcher and Lee Ann Nagtin, his brother Harrell Hays, and his four grandchildren our sympathy and prayers at this difficult time.

#### WAIVING THE RULE ON LAW IN THE BUDGET

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, as a number of my colleagues have mentioned, we will at some point today have the budget bill on the floor. I think that the consideration of this Budget Act tells us something very disturbing about the way that we proceed in the House of Representatives.

Those who day after day have come to this floor and piously told us about the need for adherence to the rule of law will tell us in this budget bill that they just do not mind a little hypocrisy, because the fact is in order to consider this budget bill on the House floor we are going to have to waive the law of the land, the budget law.

This budget does not comply with the budget law and so, therefore, the budget law has to be waived in order to bring it out here. Talk about adherence to law, those who really believe in the rule of law ought to be voting against this budget and against this rule, but they will not; they are hypocrites.

The other thing it tells us is the difference between the two philosophies we will bring to the floor. The Democrats want to raise taxes and want to keep us from having an effective defense policy. The Republicans want to cut social welfare spending and not raise taxes. That is the fundamental difference between the two philosophies, that is the fundamental difference that will be addressed in the House, and that is the reason why Re-



publicans will be voting against the budget and Democrats will vote for it.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, speaking of hypocrisy, I was watching television last evening and I saw the President in Florida. He was blaming the Federal deficits on Congress and on the lack of a constitutional provision to prohibit Federal deficits.

Mr. President, it is one thing to read a bad script. It is quite another thing to misrepresent the facts. You, Mr. President, since you have been in office, have recommended seven budgets to Congress. In every single budget you have recommended giant deficits. In fact, if you add the seven budgets up, the amount of deficit spending you have asked Congress to pass exceeds the deficits of all other Presidents in this country's history prior to your Presidency.

Let me give the American people some examples of the deficits that you asked for in your budgets. You asked for a \$189 billion deficit in fiscal year 1984, you asked for a \$144 billion deficit in your fiscal year 1987 budget, you asked for a \$179 billion deficit in your fiscal year 1986 budget, you asked for a \$180 billion deficit in your fiscal year 1985 budget, and on and on.

These budget requests with big deficits did not come from me; they came from you, Mr. President. No, they are not Jimmy Carter's deficits, they are yours. They are not Tip O'Neill's deficits, they are yours. They are not FDR's deficits, they are yours. You requested them. They are the budgets you sent to Congress.

If we have a failing, and we do in Congress, it is that we followed your leadership in fiscal policy. We are responsible for our failings and we are willing to accept that. You, on the other hand, take these flights of fantasy and move around this country pointing fingers trying to avoid responsibility.

It is time for you to join us and help solve these deficits. Yes, you proposed the biggest deficits in history. The American people know that. That is not fiction; that is real. Your deficits are there for everybody to see.

Suggesting that somehow the lack of a constitutional amendment is responsible for this problem is ludicrous. If you want a balanced budget, send us one. You have not done it in 7 years. Send us one. I challenge you to do that.

But if you do not want to do that, then join us in working responsibly to try and get rid of these fiscal policy

problems we jointly have created in the last 7 years. This kind of partisanship you exhibited yesterday is not good for the country.

Join us in constructively working to solve our problems, Mr. President.

#### THE HOTTEST RING OF HELL

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, Dante wrote in "The Inferno" that the hottest ring of hell is reserved for those who when confronted with a difficult choice refuse to make a decision.

When it comes to this budget, it appears that many Republican politicians are going to be lined up cheek to jowl in the depths of Hades.

First we will find my Republican colleagues who have come to this floor virtually every day to decry efforts to bring a budget resolution, the same Republicans who lacked the courage or the skill to draft their own resolution. The Grand Old Party has not stood this tall since the darkest days of Coolidge, Harding, and Hoover.

Then there's our President, who tours the Nation with tough talk about deficits and budget reform, the same President who has given us the highest deficits in our Nation's history, the same President who saw his Republican colleagues summarily reject his budget.

Today Members will have a chance to vote for a budget that rejects Ronald Reagan's borrow-and-spend philosophy. It says to the President if you want to spend, pay for it.

Will there be a single Republican willing to face reality, participate in the process and deal with this year's deficit with honesty and candor?

Stay tuned for the rollcall, America.

#### AMERICA SHOULD ACT BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE IN SOUTH KOREA

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the situation in South Korea gets worse every day because the existing military leadership refuses to permit free elections and democracy and wishes to perpetuate itself. The people of South Korea and those who support democracy around the world are asking: What is the United States going to do to support democracy? Are we going to wink at the existing leadership and say that because of the massive security threat from North Korea that we are not going to pressure President Chun to change his ways on behalf of democracy, or are we going to stand strongly on behalf

of free elections and an end to repression, by using our power and our leverage to bring about the freedoms that today are manifestly absent.

No one is suggesting we should withdraw our troops, no one is suggesting we should withdraw our friendship. South Korea and the United States stand close together.

But when there are riots, when the middle class, when students, when hundreds of people are objecting to repression and are asking for democracy where is the United States going to stand?

Mr. Speaker, the Olympic games are going to take place in Seoul, South Korea. There can be no Olympic games if this repression, if this instability, continues, because America's security is threatened and South Korea's internal security is threatened if there is a weak, repressive government ready to be thrown out by radical leftist forces. It is better to have a moderate broadly based government that has legitimacy for its own people. Because of his actions, President Chun and his cohorts are losing that legitimacy.

Mr. Speaker, the United States acted properly in the Philippines and it acted properly with Haiti to assist in bringing back democracy. Let us act before it is too late with South Korea. We can do it.

#### WORKING TOGETHER ON THE BUDGET

(Mr. GLICKMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to come down here and give a 1-minute speech, but quite frankly I was listening to the 1-minute speeches and decided that the American public would have to be schizophrenic watching this incredible display of partisanship on both sides trying to tell us who was at fault and, in fact, that we have not been able to get a budget agreement until today, and also blaming various parties for the state of the budget crisis we are in.

I think it is fair to say that both Republicans and Democrats, the President and Congress, must share some of the blame. It really does not do us any good, does not do the American people any good, to point fingers any more.

But I would say that today is a day of reckoning. We have worked hard, incredibly hard, particularly members of the Budget Committee, to build a consensus, to build a package on the budget. The President removed himself from this process. He left it totally to the Congress. He left it totally to the Budget Committee to work on that package.

That is not the way the Constitution intended it. The Constitution intended both parties to be involved. In this case we were left with the entire responsibility, and that is very difficult for a Congress to do totally on our own. We did our best and we produced a fair budget, a balanced budget, not a perfect budget. But it is the only budget in town, and it is the budget that will produce fair and reasonable priorities in terms of taxing and spending in this country.

I see no other options for America except to vote "yes" on this budget.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION TO SIT ON TOMORROW

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be permitted to sit tomorrow, June 24, 1987, during general debate.

I would say further, Mr. Speaker, this matter has been cleared with the ranking minority members, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KANJORSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

□ 1310

#### WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 93, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1988, AND AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF SUCH CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 201, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 201

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order, clause 2 of rule XXVIII to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider the conference report on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 93) setting forth the congressional budget for fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990, and all points of order against said conference report for failure to comply with the provisions of section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended (Public Law 93-344, as amended by Public Law 99-177), with clauses 3 and 4 of rule XXVIII are hereby waived. The conference report shall be considered as having been read when called up for consideration. Debate on the conference report shall be limited to not more than one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 2. The resolution (H. Res. 197) implementing budget procedures in the House of Representatives for fiscal year 1988 is hereby laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KANJORSKI). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 93, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1988, with 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. It also provides that the conference report shall be considered as having been read. The rule waives clauses 2, 3, and 4 of rule XXVIII. Clause 2 prohibits consideration of a conference report until it has laid over for 3 days and copies of the conference report have been available for at least 2 hours. This waiver is necessary to allow consideration of the conference report today since the report was not filed until yesterday. Clause 3 prohibits conference reports which exceed the scope of the matters submitted to conference. This waiver is necessary because scope is strictly construed in the House and some of the budget levels agreed to by the conference fall outside the range between the Senate and House-passed measures. Clause 4 prohibits matters in a conference report which would have been nongermane if they had been offered in the House to the House measure. Because some procedural matters not dealt with in the House-passed budget have been included in the conference report, this waiver is necessary.

The rule also waives section 302(a) of the Budget Act, which requires that the allocation of new budget authority, new entitlement authority and new credit authority to the committees of the House and Senate be included in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on the budget. In order to give staff time to carefully calculate the appropriate allocations based on the budget levels in the budget resolution, the conference report does not contain the allocation. Instead, it provides that the allocations will be filed in the House by the chairman of the Budget Committee no later than July 1, 1987.

Finally, the rule tables House Resolution 197. That resolution, reported by the Rules Committee on June 17, 1987, would have provided that, for purposes of the Budget Act in the House, the Congress would be considered to have finally adopted House Resolution 93 as passed the House on

April 9, 1987. This was reported when it appeared that there might be further delay in reaching an agreement on the conference report on the budget, but since agreement has been reached there is no need to consider that resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this budget reduces the deficit by more than \$36 billion next year. At the same time, it provides for the legitimate needs of the citizens of this Nation by preserving the funding for emergency national priorities contained in the House-passed budget resolution. This ensures adequate funding for AIDS education and research, for the homeless, for education, for trade and welfare reform and for catastrophic health care insurance and other health programs.

This budget also provides for a strong national defense, but it declares that we will no longer pay for huge defense increases with a Federal credit card. The budget provides that an additional \$7 billion requested by the President for defense will be available only if the deficit reduction legislation called for by this budget is enacted.

Of course, this budget is not perfect. Anyone who wants to find an excuse to oppose it will have no trouble. But the question to ask anyone who urges a no vote is not why he opposes it, but where is his alternative and where has that alternative been for the last 6 months? If the answer is that he has no alternative, I can only assume that he is heeding the advice given during the debate on the budget resolution in April that you can avoid trouble by being against budgets. I just hope that there are not many Members in this body who are more concerned with avoiding trouble than with being responsible on an issue of this importance.

I urge a "yes" vote on this resolution and on the conference report on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me first of all point out that this resolution makes in order the consideration of \$1 trillion budget conference report and we are supposed to debate it under this rule for only 60 minutes.

The question is why should we limit debate on \$1 trillion conference report to 1 hour? The Budget Act calls for 5 hours. You have to ask yourself why does the leadership insist on limiting debate to 1 hour? Is it afraid that more debate would throw too much light on the weaknesses in this budget with its bundle of higher taxes, its failure to provide adequately for national security, and its failure to terminate programs or to reduce unnecessary Government spending?



I know the people that put this together contend that this is a budget that meets the "people's priorities" and I put that in quotation marks. Since when have the American people made it their priority to ask for \$19.3 billion in higher taxes in 1 year? Since when have the American people set as their priority to have an attempt made by the Democrats to blackmail their President into agreeing to these taxes in order to stave off disastrous defense cuts? Since when have the American people said, "We don't care about reducing Federal spending"?

And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I had a poll in my district just recently and only about 6 percent of the people in the district indicated they wanted to balance the budget or to reduce the deficit by increasing taxes. They wanted to reduce expenditures, not to increase taxes.

I think the Democrats have completely misread the people's priorities in this budget. The \$19.3 billion in higher taxes is more than the \$18 billion agreed to previously by the House and Senate in separate budget resolutions.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, every single Republican opposed that resolution that called for \$18 billion in new taxes. So it is obvious that they should oppose this resolution when it is made an order by this rule calling for \$19.3 billion in new taxes.

This figure alone, Mr. Speaker, puts the conference agreement outside the proper scope of the conference.

So, the Democrat-controlled Rules Committee had to grant a waiver of points of order against a question of scope.

The Committee on Rules in the rule also waived the requirement of germaneness. There is a question about the germaneness of linking the level of defense to a requirement that the President agree to higher taxes because that linkage was in the Senate resolution, but not in the House budget resolution.

That leads me to my next point about how poor this budget really is. On major questions such as linking defense and taxes, the House Democrat conferees caved in to the Senate. In fact, the House Democrat conferees could have saved themselves a lot of time by simply agreeing to the Senate budget in the first meeting of the conference committee more than a month ago.

In the rule the Rules Committee also waives the budget law's requirement that the explanatory statement on the conference report must include section 302(a) allocations to standing committees.

So we have no 302(a) allocations. Are the numbers in this conference agreement really that elusive? How do we judge whether appropriation bills are within the ceiling of the budget if we

have no 302(a) allocation to the Appropriations Committee? This week alone, Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled to consider four appropriation bills, one of them later today.

This could be the worst budget agreement this House has ever been asked to consider simply because of one thing—tax hikes. Only last year this Congress told the American people that we were going to try to make their taxes fairer. So we took away some of their deductions which they had enjoyed for years and we promised, in return, to lower their tax rates.

But now the Democrat majority produces a budget with almost \$20 billion in new taxes for next year and a total of about \$65 billion in new taxes over the next 3 years. It is pretty obvious that such a new tax burden would wipe out a lot of the benefits that the people might get from tax reform. It does not matter how these taxes are levied, they would still be levied on the American people.

Certainly it is up to the Committee on Ways and Means to determine where those taxes ought to be imposed. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has already said that even raising \$18 billion in revenues much less \$19.3 billion, "will be very difficult."

He also said when it comes to designating the specific taxes to be levied, "There is a silence in that room that is deafening."

Well, if this conference agreement is accepted then eventually that silence in the Committee on Ways and Means room will be broken.

Now, how are you going to get \$19.3 billion in new taxes? There are several ways you can do it. I do not know whether any of them would not be painful to the American people.

For example, to raise \$10 billion in new taxes you would have to raise the gasoline tax by 12 cents per gallon. You would have to have a \$5 per barrel fee on oil imports to raise \$8 billion.

If you doubled the cigarette tax to 32 cents a pack you get \$3 billion. Increase taxes on beer and wines to the same rate as charged for distilled spirits and you can pick up \$4 billion. Delay the reductions, or renege on the reduction, I might say to put it more bluntly, in the income tax rates scheduled for 1988 for corporations as well as individuals, and you come up with \$17 billion.

The committee may also extend Medicare coverage to all State and local government employees, to produce about \$1.3 billion from new taxes on the States and local governments and the employees themselves.

I remind you that the House voted May 12 to instruct budget conferees on a motion that I made not to raise the income tax rates to provide the

revenue. To raise the rates would be an open breach of faith with the American people on tax reform.

Another possibility is an increase in estate taxes which would make it especially difficult to maintain the family farm within the family when the breadwinner dies.

No matter how the money is raised, it comes from the pockets of the American people, men and women who would much rather see this Congress make an effort to cut unnecessary spending.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason I must ask my colleagues not only to reject the conference report but the rule which makes it an order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT].

Mr. LOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes reading a rule is a little like reading tea leaves or entrails: It can tell you a lot about what lies ahead. And this rule on the budget resolution conference report sure tells us a lot about the Democrats' budget.

In the first place we waive clause 2 of rule XXVIII which requires that conference reports be available for 3 days before they are considered. Even though the conferees announced an agreement last Wednesday night, this report was not filed in the House until yesterday, meaning it only became available to Members' with the delivery this morning of their Monday CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And, even though it was requested that we not waive the 2-hour availability rule in that same clause, this rule even waives that requirement. That means we could have called up the conference report under this rule without it even being available to Members.

What does this tell us about the Democrats' budget? What it says to me is that the Democrats would rather we not read what is in this budget resolution. There's no need for us to consider this before we take up the first appropriations bill since we already have a provision in the Budget Act which permits consideration of appropriations bills after May 15 without final agreement on a budget resolution.

My suspicions about the Democrats' lack of pride in their budget is further confirmed by the fact that the rule provides for only 1 hour of debate on the conference report, even though section 305(a)(6) of the Budget Act provides for 5 hours of debate on a budget conference report. The fact is, they would rather not have a prolonged discussion about their call for higher taxes, higher domestic spending, and lower defense spending.

Another interesting aspect about this rule is that it waives clauses 3 and

4 of rule 28 against the conference report. Those clauses prohibit nongermane Senate amendments and matters which go beyond the scope of matters committed to conference by either House. Now, I can understand the problems we usually have with nongermane Senate amendments. But we should be especially wary when conferees report back something that goes beyond the scope of what was passed by either House. When I inquired about this in the Rules Committee I was informed that the scope waiver was for "technical reasons" only. And yet, when I pursued this I learned that one of the main reasons for the scope waiver was that the conferees provided more taxes in the first year than either House; more taxes over 3 years than either House; and more nondefense spending than either House. This is hardly a technical waiver, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, this rule waives section 302(a) of the Budget Act which requires that the allocations to committees of budget authority, outlays, credit authority, and entitlement authority be included in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the budget conference report. Instead, the conference report, in section 13, gives the Budget Committee chairman, not the committee, up until next Wednesday, July 1, to file those allocations. What that means is that the Appropriations Committee will not have to file its 302(b) suballocations until after that time, and any appropriations bills reported prior to that will not be subject to points of order due to lack of suballocations being filed. In short, this provision permits the Appropriations Committee to go forward with some six or seven bills which may exceed the suballocations that are later filed. There is no explanation in the conference report as to why this provision is included. One can only assume that it was done for the convenience of the Appropriations Committee which has gone forward with its work. But it is a major loophole through which one can drive billions in excess spending.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this rule because it is a blatant reflection of what is wrong with this budget and the budget process.

□ 1325

Over the years I had been a supporter of the Budget Impoundment Act, but it has just become something to delay actions on authorization bills, on appropriations bills.

It really is nonexistent. It is just an embarrassment to this body, and certainly this budget resolution is an embarrassment to the Congress; but it will be an economic burden for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge that the Members vote against this rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant, but determined, opposition to the resolution.

I am reluctant because, as a member of the Budget Committee and the conference committee, I worked hard to develop this budget, and to assure that it addressed the more critical priorities of our Nation.

But I am determined in my opposition because the promise contained in the House-passed resolution has been squandered and replaced with a short-term compromise which undermines our efforts toward a steady—and equitable—program of deficit reduction.

I am as aware as anyone else that this budget is being viewed as a test of whether the Democratic Party can govern. The real question is, Can we govern well?

The budget resolution which passed the House this spring fulfilled our pledge of balanced spending cuts, targeted support for high priority programs, and responsible deficit reduction.

We cut over \$6 billion from domestic programs, and from military programs, too, as dictated by the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings budget law. We raised less in new revenues than recommended by the President in his own budget. And we met the deficit targets of the law.

But this conference report fails to maintain either the spirit or the essence of that House resolution.

Under this budget, the spending reductions, which are supposed to be evenly balanced between domestic and military, are widely out of harmony.

Domestic programs would be cut back \$6.3 billion. Those cuts were necessary to make room for the high priority programs which must be addressed in any responsible budget: expansion of health care for poor seniors, mothers, and infants; improved nutrition for high risk babies and their mothers; expanded early childhood education, child care, and preventive children's services; accelerated research and education programs to combat AIDS; enactment of a welfare reform plan that stresses training, education, and conversion to work.

We did not get everything we wanted. In fact, the children's initiative, which I authored, was severely pared back, and only a few of its component pieces received line-item increases. The rest must compete through the appropriations process with many other worthy programs.

Why? Because we were told that we couldn't do everything we wanted to do, or needed to do, to improve the quality of children's lives, to stimulate

American economic resurgence, and to expand the job and educational opportunities for millions of young people. We could only initiate new programs to the extent we cut back other programs.

But as so often happens in this body, the military gets to play by different rules.

For the military, we ignore the requirement that cutbacks affect domestic and military programs equally.

We ignore fact that the entire children's initiative could be funded for a year through just 1 day's spending by the Pentagon.

We ignore the requirement that spending increases be paid for through offsetting cuts or new taxes—although that principle still holds for other areas of the budget.

Instead, this resolution not only gives the military more than the House allowed, but far more than an even split with the Senate.

This resolution grants the Pentagon nearly \$8 billion more in outlays than the House level of \$281.7 billion, and just \$1 billion less than the Senate resolution. That is over \$3 billion more than an even split with the House would have yielded.

Nor is this the only area where the conference report greatly exceeds the House figures. The report allows \$600 million more in science and space, \$1 billion more in energy, and \$1.3 billion more in natural resources.

By contrast, the resolution allocates less than the House levels in education and social services, community development and commerce, and housing.

Are these the priorities of the Democratic Party? Are these the priorities we had in mind when we rallied against losing the educational competitive edge against our trading partners, and made all those promises about expanding educational opportunities?

Are these the priorities we had in mind last winter when we vetoed emergency assistance for the homeless so that low-income families would no longer be forced to join the army of the homeless created by the shortsighted housing and health policies of this administration?

We don't have the money, we are told, to increase WIC participation much above its current paltry level; but we have billions to throw at SDI, the pie-in-the-sky boondoggle that most of our leading physicists tell us will not work.

We don't have the money to really expand Head Start, or childhood immunizations, or preventive services to avoid foster care; but we have \$8 billion more to spend on the Pentagon.

And why will we spend that additional money? Because a few men in the other body are willing to subject our party, and this Congress, to delay,



embarrassment, and deadlock unless they get their way.

Some call that the legislative process.

I call it legislative blackmail, and I won't lend my support to it.

Now, I would have greater inclination to support the process if those who demand that we spend the money also had the courage to suggest where the money is going to come from. But they don't.

The military increase would allegedly be paid for by the REA refinancing, which only provides a 1-year bonus, much of which will be consumed paying for the farm credit system bailout.

What about the second year of military spending which will be generated by \$7.3 billion in additional budget authority? How is that going to be paid for? And the third year? And the fourth?

By diverting revenues which are supposed to go for deficit reduction? How many Members are willing to tell their constituents that they voted to raise taxes in order to pay for a big military increase?

By raising new taxes next year? Who is willing to commit to that vote?

By further cutbacks in domestic programs, which we cut over \$6 billion in this resolution, and which have already suffered the deepest cuts of all in the last 7 years, over \$100 billion?

The answer is that no one knows how we will pay for the military additions next year or the year after or the year after that. But we all know that when you increase budget authority for the military, you pay a heavy price for many years to come in outlays which are virtually impossible to stop.

I do not want to leave the impression that there is nothing supportable in this resolution. In fact, with the exception of the military windfall, I would support it. I would even vote for it if we had the courage to pay for the windfall.

There are many important initiatives in the budget. It contains a second year of the children's initiative, with sufficient funding to bring hundreds of thousands of additional children into proven programs that will reduce long-term health, nutrition, and educational costs.

We include an increase in the title XX Social Security Block Grant, which is the source of vital services for seniors as well as children. Title XX supports a substantial amount of the child care which is so essential to working parents and to those who wish to join the work force.

We expand the WIC Program substantially, a program which saves \$3 for every \$1 it costs us to provide nutritional supplements to high risk women and their infants.

We include a Medicaid infant mortality initiative that will expand

health care available to poor children under the age of 5 and to other highly vulnerable groups—at a cost measured in the thousandths of 1 percent of the budget.

The budget allows for an increase in the funding for the title IV-B Child Welfare Services Program, which is desperately needed in order to provide inhome protective services to children in order to reduce the incidence of child abuse and the need for, and duration of, expensive foster care placements.

And other proven programs—chapter I, education for the handicapped, Job Corps, maternal and child health—will receive increased funding because this budget was designed to choose priorities that are necessary for America, priorities that make an investment in the future of this country and its people.

For these reasons, I would prefer to vote for this resolution. But the effort we made toward responsible budgeting, toward selecting the proper priorities, toward equity in spending allotments and reductions—all these are thwarted by the \$8 billion Pentagon bonus insisted upon by the Senate.

The administration and its allies in this body have no right to criticize our efforts. The President knows how hard it is to write a budget: in fact, the budget he sent to Congress this year was rightly hooted down by Democrats and Republicans alike.

In fact, in the first 6 years that President Reagan entered the White House, when his party also controlled the other body, the debt grew from \$931 billion to \$2.28 trillion, an increase of 145 percent.

Those same Republicans sat sphynx-like in the Budget Committee during our markup this year, giving up their right and abandoning their obligation to participate in writing this budget.

And while our Republican friends blame Democrats for spending too much, let's remember that the budgets produced by Congress have consistently spent less than those submitted by the President.

Indeed, what is wrong with the budget produced by the conference committee is that it follows the Reagan model by igniting a Pentagon spending spree without any means of paying for it. And like Mr. Reagan, it forces all of the spending cuts from the hard-hit domestic side of the ledger while allowing the military to escape unscathed.

Whether we support this conference report or oppose it, we must acknowledge that it does continue the congressional effort to pare down the budget.

By imposing strict limitations on spending, and by forcing cutbacks, we have reduced the deficit by nearly one-third in just 2 years. Much more needs to be done. And to achieve the goal of steady, sound deficit reduction,

we must resist the temptation to excuse any portion of the budget from the strict guidelines we have written.

Because this conference report fails to follow that rule, because it provides an unwarranted bonanza to the Pentagon, and because it plants the seeds of increased deficits in the near future, I will vote "no."

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Rules Committee is at least embarrassed for having brought this rule to the floor. The rule itself is an embarrassment. It tells us just how bad the budget we are about to consider really is.

First of all, this rule waives the Budget Act for purposes of consideration of the budget. It tells us there is something awfully bad about a budget that has to be brought to the floor in violation of the very law that created the budget process in the first place. I think that tells us more than we need to know about the process we are going through here on the floor.

Second, what this rule says to us is that this is a budget resolution so bad that we cannot even read it when it is brought to the floor. The conference report is not even going to be read. That is despite the fact that the committee had not even seen the budget report at the point when they considered this rule. This rule was filed before the report had been filed in the House, yet we are not going to have it read in the House of Representatives.

Finally, contrary to law, we are going to have only 1 hour of debate on this resolution rather than the 5 hours provided for in the rule. The reason that discourages some of us is that we are talking about \$1 trillion in spending here.

A trillion dollars in spending becomes almost a meaningless figure, because no one can understand the magnitude of it. But if you take 60 million Americans, one-quarter of the country, and take every good, and service they produce, take all their salaries, take all the money they make doing everything, and add it up for 1 year, that comes somewhere close to \$1 trillion. I would venture to guess that virtually every one of those people spends more than an hour of time determining what it is they are going to do with their money earned during that year, and every one of those companies producing those goods and services spends more than an hour of time deciding how to allocate their resources in a given year. But we are going to spend just 1 hour of time to make a decision that 60 million people make in this country. I think that it is a travesty.

Mr. Speaker, this rule should be rejected. We ought to get about the business of a budget process that really works, not this kind of a process.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes, for purposes of debate only, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that should govern the activities of the House here today as we reflect upon the budget, and that is "Don't let your mouth write a check that your funds can't cash."

I want the Members to think about that, because just briefly I want to reflect on what the President's policies were as they relate to budgets he would submit to Congress.

As a candidate opposing now Vice President GEORGE BUSH, Mr. Reagan said that he would balance the budget by 1983, and he sold a "free lunch" to the American people that sounded so good that many workers in manufacturing plants who are now out in the cold voted for Mr. Reagan. He told them exactly what he was going to do, and anybody with some common sense could figure out that they would lose their jobs. In fact, Mr. BUSH said, "Listen carefully to this free lunch package or you are going to lose your job." Everybody laughed, and a lot of Democrats bought it. Let us tell it like it is. There are a lot of Democrats in this country who put the man in on Pennsylvania Avenue. But here is what he said he was going to do—and listen to this, because it still sounds good, and it is still playing and continues to play around the country—he said, "I'm going to cut your taxes, and not only that," he said, "I'm going to cut your boss's taxes, and when I cut all these taxes, you're going to say, my God, there is going to be red ink all the way to Maine."

But, no, that is not true because, you see, when he said, "When I cut those taxes, I'm going to put that money in your pocket and you are going to spend it, and when you spend it, the gross national product is going to rise, and through economic growth, even though I have changed the mathematical formula, there will be more money in the pot, America will raise more revenue, and we will step through this thing on the supply side-trickle down economic theory."

Well, after he was elected, I have to give the President credit. I am probably one of his biggest critics, there is no question about that, but one thing he does, when he makes a mistake or if he says something that turns out not to be true, he usually looks the people in the eye and tells them the way it is. I sort of like him for that, too. I have to give him credit for that.

So then after he was elected, 6 months later, he said, "Ladies and gen-

tleman, I did make a mistake. I will not be able to balance the Federal budget by 1983." He said, "It will take me till the fall of 1984."

□ 1340

Now, Mr. BUSH, who was his opponent back then, said, "Ladies and gentlemen, if you elect this man, he will double the national debt in his first term. He will export all or nearly all the manufacturing jobs in this country. He will take us"—these are not my words, these are now the Vice President's words, who is so close behind the President, if Mr. Reagan stops abruptly he will be the most embarrassed man in Washington, DC; that is, until Iran-Contra.

But he said he would double the national debt. He will take us from a credit nation to a debtor nation and, yes, he might even bring back Mr. Hoover in 1929.

Now, that was during the great debates to see who would be the nominee for the Republican Party, and we know Mr. Reagan won; but here is the record now. Let us not confuse it. Let us put it right where it is, because what we are voting on today is we are either going to put in motion a plane we can fly through the legislative process or we are going to continue on with the crash course of Air Force One and we are going to bankrupt this country and we are going to hurt everyone on the streets and put a lot more in the streets.

Over a 5-year period from 1982 to 1986, the Federal deficit has averaged \$191 billion. Jimmy Carter's last year in an election year when he was running for his life was \$57 billion.

Do you remember the famous words of Mr. Reagan, "Oh, it's not the 300 days of the hostages in Iran. That's not what history will reflect on Mr. Carter \* \* \*" good political jargon. He said, "What they will remember is the red ink of this President, the greatest red ink in American history."

Well, he made Jimmy Carter look like a shopper at K-Mart.

The U.S. trade deficit, Mr. Speaker, has quadrupled. It was \$170 billion last year. We are still giving a toll road free to Japan while we are paying for it. Think about it.

We talk about trade. Let us talk about an American Express Card policy. Japan, Europe, Taiwan, Korea, they send bills over here and we pay them in 30 days cash. This thing is crazy.

Everything that Mr. BUSH said has come true.

Now, what will we do about it? I am not totally happy with this budget. I do not like any increase in defense spending.

We have gone to \$300 billion. We have laser umbrellas. Everything we talk about explodes and detonates. My God, our generals and admirals are

telling us that if there is a war, it will be a conventional war and we will get beat.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

But there are two specific points and some statistical data that may be boring to some, but should be placed on the record here today. The real gross national product has increased at only a 2.4-percent rate over the 1981 through 1986 period. This was below the previous administration's 1977 through 1988 average of 3 percent, and the postwar average of 1949 through 1980 of 3.4 percent.

This great turnaround has not occurred. The average unemployment rate over that 6-year period was 8.1 percent, the highest of any period over any given period of time by any one President.

Now, in my district we lost 55,000 jobs. They averaged \$9 to \$12 an hour and full benefits. We replaced them with this new trickle-down economic suffer policy. We created about 10,000 jobs that paid \$3.50 to \$5.50 an hour, with no benefits, and most of them are on some form of public welfare, working full time, qualifying for Government subsidies.

Is this the type of future economic program the Congress wants to fashion? I do not know. I am new here. Maybe I have forgotten all those sophisticated Harvard analyses. I do not know, but all I am saying is that if you go to the dance, someone has got to pay for the band.

I do not like the increases that may come about in this budget, but at least it says the President is going to have to come up with some of the ante.

Now, I believe that America is tired of being taxed, and rightfully so. I do agree that our party over here is very flippantly flirting with an issue that the American people still do not understand. We may have to raise revenues, but we could do that by stopping these large multinational corporations taking profits out of this country and not even paying taxes on those profits. That is just one small initiative.

There are ways we can raise revenues. There are ways we can continue to bring the deficit problem in this country down under control.

One thing that this plan does, it gives at least some blueprint that maybe even the Republicans might support. They sure were not going to support that of the President's, and that is the way it is, because we called your hand and asked for the vote and there are Members over there who are



still needing medication from that vote.

So with that, I say that I am going to support this rule. This is not the best budget, but it is the only budget that I believe we can make happen. I would hope that the Members would consider that and pass this later today.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, following the gentleman from Ohio, I can understand some of his frustration, I am sure, having been a recent addition to this House. Had he been here back in those roaring sixties and early seventies when very little attention was given to balancing the budget, to what we were doing by incremental increases in one appropriation bill after another, and an authorization bill that provided for entitlement programs that have led us to the point where we are today, and then never taking a look back to see what we did at that time by way of just piling on one additional authorization after another, I can understand the gentleman's frustration.

There are others of us, too, who come from a district that may be similar to his that have had a little different story to tell of late. Yes, we were down, too, in the recession of 1982, like a number of other districts around the country. But there are those districts, like mine, that have made some adjustments from those very bad days when we finally had to come to the clear recognition that exorbitantly high wages and fringe benefits and all the rest took us out of the realm of being competitive.

Now I look at one industry after another in my own district cutting costs back 20, 25, and 30 percent, and everybody else scaling back to the degree that even the steel companies today are making money. That says something about the adjustment that was made out there in the private sector as a result of just the economic situation facing the country. We ought to do some adjusting here at the Federal level that would emulate and mirror what the private sector has done, but we have not been doing that.

I am sorry to say, too, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Mississippi pointed out, with respect to this rule. I guess this gentleman has expressed his dismay over the whole budget process of late. Earlier on we tried our best to see that it would work, offered probably as many amendments and revisions of that act as any Member of this House to try to make it work, but here we are again under this rule violating all the dates, violating all the provisions and all the mandates and waivers and all the rest, just for the sake of bringing this conference report to us.

At the beginning of this historic 100th Congress, the Democratic leadership led us to believe their budget would be a shiny, streamlined vehicle to take us along the road to economic responsibility.

Now, 5 months later, we see the budget vehicle they have presented us with is not shiny and streamlined.

It is, what could be likened to, a worn-out used car: Engine clanking, tires bald, carburetor clogged, brakes shot, paint chipped, and windshield cracked.

And there, crammed into the front seat of this wheezing japloy is the Democratic leadership, smiling and beckoning us to take a ride along the bumpy road of higher taxes, and low defense figures.

I've got news for the Democratic leadership. This used car has flunked inspection.

Inspect its economic premises if you will, inspect its numbers, inspect its intolerable abandonment of a responsible defense policy, inspect its domestic spending cuts, inspect its typical Democratic leadership's reliance on increasing taxes—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, inspect all of these and you see this budget isn't going to take anyone anyplace—except take the taxpayers to the cleaners.

When this 100th Congress began, we were promised leadership by those who now control both Houses of the Congress.

We heard so many stirring and inspiring words about how the Democratic leadership would get things done.

That was January. This is June. That was then. This is now.

And I ask you—what have you given us this day?

With a chance to really change things around here, you have regressed to the vice of raising taxes instead of cutting costs.

You have put your official stamp of approval on a national defense posture that neither meets our Nation's needs or addresses our geostrategic responsibilities.

Worst of all, you have failed at the easiest, simplest, most noncommittal phase of the budget process. The hard part actually is implementing the game plan.

You promised us new ideas and new leadership in the 100th Congress—but what we have in your budget is the winner in the Walter Mondale 1984 Presidential campaign look-alike contest.

It fails on economic grounds. It fails as policy. And it fails as an expression of leadership.

I say it just won't do and we ought to reject this conference report today.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to make a decision and the decision will be whether or not we will present a blueprint to the Nation for a balanced set of priorities and for realistic, responsible and achievable deficit reduction.

Is it going to be easy? No, it is not.

Is it a perfect document? No, it is not.

But let me remind America that on this floor just a few weeks ago the President's budget was not ignored. It was presented and only 27 Members of this body would vote for the President's budget. That is less than 20 percent of all the Members of this body who belong to the President's party.

At the same time, many of those who are standing here now and will be standing here later talking about the Democrats taxing and spending are people who did not present a budget, a blueprint themselves. In fact, their leadership argued that the best route to take was to vote against all budgets. Play it safe. Give no plan.

I can understand that, because America knows what has happened in the last 7 years while the Republicans occupied the White House and the Senate. The deficits went up from about \$40 billion and \$50 billion to over \$200 billion. The national debt, that took 39 Presidents to create less than \$1 trillion, got doubled to over \$2.1 trillion.

Well, this Democratic plan may not be the best, but it is one that is achievable. It is one that will bring deficit reduction.

Let me respond to that great old cry of "tax and spend." No, this is not a tax and spend budget. In fact, what this budget says is, "Mr. President, if you want to spend on your priorities of the Pentagon, if we need more national security, than pay for it. Don't borrow it out of education and health care where you wanted to cut 60 percent in order to receive your spending cuts in the budget that even the Members of your own party would not support. Don't shortchange the educational future of our children. Don't cut the health care of the poor and the elderly. If you want more defense, then pay for it."

So the tax and spend that they are talking about is the fact that we are now saying that if you want to spend more do not put it on the credit card.

Do not spend-spend, borrow-borrow, but pay for it.

Well, I think that is a lot better than borrowing. I think the American people will support that kind of a budget that says, "Mr. President, if you want to spend more on the Pentagon, then be willing to pay for it right now. Don't take it out of education and health care and the future of our children."

The next rationale that you will hear will be one of budget process as to why we cannot participate in deficit reduction. The very same people who brought you the deficit reduction monster say now, "We can't participate in reducing the deficit."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

□ 1355

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the very same people whose policies brought us the deficits now say that they cannot participate in deficit reduction until somehow there is reform of the process.

Did we not hear that just a couple of years ago with Gramm-Rudman, the same people who said, "Reform the process"? Well, we reformed the process—Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. Now they are back again saying, "Reform the process."

I think that the American public knows that it is not the process that is in need of repair. What is really in need of repair is some leadership on Capitol Hill and down in the White House that will say, "Let's make the right decisions and reduce these deficits."

Giving a constitutional amendment to balance the budget to this President will mean nothing. Why? Because he has already had seven opportunities to present a balanced budget, and he has not presented one yet. But he wants a constitutional amendment for the next person who sits in the White House, not for him.

What about a line-item veto, which would badly bring into imbalance the constitutional checks-and-balances system? Would it mean that he would strike educational programs, health-care programs, as he did in his budget? No, I do not think that is the solution. What we really need is some leadership on all sides of the aisle, and also down at the White House, that will say, "Let's come up with a deficit-reduction plan."

Until we have that leadership from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who voted "present" as we wrote the budget in committee and who voted against practically every alternative, I say that this is the best vehicle that says, "Mr. President, if you want

more defense, pay for it. If you want lower deficits, here it is, it is up to you. And if you want lower spending, it is up to you also."

I urge Members to vote for the rule and also for this deficit-reduction plan, the comprehensive approach and a balanced approach for 1988.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUNDQUIST].

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and to the 1988 budget conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks, we've been watching the clash of priorities within the leadership controlling the budget conference committee. The issue today is not the President or the Vice President, the issue today is the 1988 budget conference agreement.

For the past several months, we have witnessed the partisan lambasting of the President's budget and the President's priorities. Even the great economic growth that the President created in his administration cannot outdistance the big spenders in this House.

For the past several years now, we've heard the attacks on deficit spending from the born-again budget balancers in the Congress. If only they regained their chance to fully govern the Congress, we were told, deficit spending would stop dead in its tracks. "Words are not enough," we were told. "What counts is action."

Well, the time for action arrived on the day the conference convened. And after a month of inaction, the moment of truth arrived last week.

We were promised a budget agreement which ratchets down the size of Government. Instead, we have been presented with a budget that increases domestic spending \$47 billion above fiscal year 1987—and \$38 billion above President Reagan's budget.

We were promised an end to "smoke-and-mirrors" deficit-reduction techniques. Instead, we've been presented with \$7.2 billion in accounting changes that cut the deficit on paper only.

We were promised "truth in budgeting." Instead, we've been presented a budget using clearly outdated economic assumptions.

We were promised a document that makes the tough choices necessary to hammer away at the deficit. Instead, we've been presented an agreement that terminates not a single Federal program; that increases outlays at almost twice the rate of speed as last year; and that threatens to raise taxes on low- and middle-income Americans before the ink even dries on tax reform.

Finally, we were promised a responsible defense budget based on the Nation's national security needs—not politics. Instead, Congress will today rub-

berstamp a document that holds our national security hostage to a political blackmail scheme. In return for \$7 billion in outlays that would allow no real growth in defense spending, the President would have to agree to more than \$64 billion in taxes. Even more distressing is the prospect that if the President pays the ransom, there's no guarantee he'd get the hostage. In the past 5 years, Congress has shifted \$27 billion from defense allocations into domestic programs. There is no guarantee that once the \$7 billion inflation increase is allocated, the money would be spent on defense.

For all of those in this body who have expressed condemnation in the past year for paying ransom for hostages, I ask: Is this a serious proposal? Is this a realistic negotiating document for the budget summit you want to force? Is this the way Members of Congress should set priorities for our Nation's defense?

Mr. Speaker, this rule and the conference agreement may make for good politics, but a conference report on the budget should reflect much more than political defiance. We are told today that we are voting on a budget agreement that cuts the deficit responsibly, fairly, and with accuracy. This agreement does none of the above. As someone once said, Mr. Speaker, words are not enough. What counts is action.

Taxes are still taxes. Taxes are still taxes. And to quote my colleague from Ohio—I think that this is what he said—my own party is playing flippancy with a subject that our supporters do not understand. Well, I assume that that means that our constituents do not want a tax increase, but the majority party in this body is going to force it down their throats so that they can tax and spend some more.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 93, the congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 1988.

Mr. Speaker, this budget is far from perfect. In particular, I am greatly concerned by what I view as excessive funding for defense programs. However, I believe that on balance, the budget conferees have done an admirable job of crafting a budget that is far preferable to the President's version. The resolution maintains or increases funding for urgently needed domestic spending programs, including a major increase for AIDS research, education and prevention. And it begins the process of identifying the real causes of our Nation's deficit ills and proposing substantive solutions.

There is incontrovertible evidence that our Nation's massive budget deficits are the direct



result of the Reagan administration's unprecedented defense buildup and its extravagant tax giveaways to the wealthy. This resolution begins the process of restoring the revenues that are necessary to adequately fund the Federal Government. It calls for \$19.3 billion in unspecified new revenues, to be included in reconciliation legislation later this year.

The resolution does call for a \$6.4 billion increase in defense appropriations as compared to last year, for a total of \$296.0 billion. I believe that the House resolution, which called for \$288.7 billion in defense spending for the coming year, is far preferable in this regard. However, the level called for in the final agreement remains slightly less than what is required to maintain current defense programs when inflation is taken into account.

Moreover, the conferees have wisely made approval of these additional defense funds contingent upon the President's approval of reconciliation legislation that contains additional revenues. If the President is serious about a higher defense figure, he will have to give his approval to the taxes that are necessary to support that figure. If he chooses not to sign such legislation, the defense spending figure will revert to a level of \$289 billion—very close to the initial House position.

The conferees increased fiscal year 1988 defense outlays more than they increased budget authority. This means that, if the President signs reconciliation legislation, the subsequent increase in defense spending will be more likely to accommodate growth in the personnel and readiness accounts rather than additional spending on weapons systems.

While the agreement calls for \$6.75 billion in domestic spending cuts, it maintains or improves funding for programs that serve urgent human needs.

In the area of health care, the agreement prevents increased costs to Medicare beneficiaries and calls for improvements in Medicaid services to low-income elderly, children, and pregnant women. The resolution also calls for a major increase in funding for programs to combat the deadly AIDS epidemic.

The agreement also calls for an additional \$2.2 billion over the amount required to keep pace with inflation for essential employment and training programs, including compensatory education, handicapped education, Pell grants and other need-based student financial aid, Head Start, and Community Services block grants. And it includes \$550 million in new assistance to the homeless.

For natural resources and environment programs, the resolution recommends \$2 billion more than the House resolution. And in the area of foreign aid, the agreement maintains full funding of assistance to Israel and Egypt.

However, despite these gains, funding for all domestic spending programs remains severely threatened by the Gramm-Rudman law. The arbitrary Gramm-Rudman deficit targets will continue to place pressure on the Congress to slash spending for urgent needs. And the efforts of many Members to restore automatic spending cuts, which were voided by the Supreme Court, will only exacerbate the problem.

The problem with Gramm-Rudman and with the other deficit snake oils that are now being hawked by the President is that they do not

deal with the root causes of the deficit crisis. Until we reform wasteful defense spending practices and until we regain needed revenues, there will be no solution to our deficit ills.

We should not involve ourselves in debating the question of how Gramm-Rudman can be fixed, because that is not a realistic option. The initial passage of Gramm-Rudman was an unparalleled admission of failure and political cowardice, and efforts to restore or repair its enforcement mechanisms must be seen in the same light.

The Congress has proved that it can reach agreement on measures that place the deficit on a downward path without unduly burdening average Americans. We should approve this latest effort as crafted by the budget conferees. And we should then focus our efforts on preventing any ill-advised effort to restore mandatory spending cuts as an amendment to the debt ceiling legislation to be considered next month.

The time has come to recognize that a serious error has been made. We cannot stand by while the Gramm-Rudman law threatens the very future of programs that serve human needs. We must eliminate this threat and continue the task that has been begun with this budget resolution—the task of producing a realistic and sensible response to the deficit crisis.

The only amendment that should be offered to the debt ceiling increase is a simple amendment to repeal Gramm-Rudman.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes, for purposes of debate only, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, what do you do when you are President, your popularity is plummeting, the Senate has gone to the other party, and the Iran-Contra hearings grind on day after day. You try to create a smokescreen with your favorite issue—the budget.

But, Mr. President, the public has seen this movie. It is the same old plot, and they are not going to pay to see it again.

The public knows, Mr. President, that when Carter left office, the deficit was \$60 billion, and it is \$200 billion now. The public knows, Mr. President, that you have talked about a balanced-budget amendment for 6 years, and you have submitted a budget deliriously out of balance for 7. The public knows, Mr. President, that you have created a defense sinkhole replete with \$600 toilet seats and \$200 screwdrivers without a way to pay for it. And the public knows most of all, Mr. President, that the budget process is a process of compromise. The budget process requires that the House, the Senate, and the President meet to compromise, to bring the issues together, not to spread them apart, in order to get anywhere.

I would say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle and to my President that it is very easy to criticize; it is

very hard to create. Yet we have a problem of such national consequence that we all must come together and create.

Mr. President, you can go anywhere that you want, you can make any speech that you choose, you can kick around any Member of this body whom you select, but the public will know that you are part of the problem, not part of the solution.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, today you pass another budget resolution that is a collection of unrealistic assumptions, accounting gimmicks, quick fixes, fudged numbers, and unspecified tax increases.

You have taken fudging the numbers to a new level of absurdity by creating a new budget line for it. Why not amend the Budget Act to designate a function number 970 and call it the "Fudge Factor" function?

You fudge the numbers every year and no one seems to care. Deficit reduction has become a bad joke, and our kids will pay for the \$200 billion annual punchline.

This budget is 10 weeks late, a whole week ahead of last year's pathetic pace.

Why did it take the Democrat conferees 10 weeks to agree to eliminate all spending restraint, except in defense?

The House gave up its only real cuts in natural resources and space programs while the other body gave up on trying to restrain health and welfare.

So, taxes are up and defense is down. I wonder why it took the Democrats 10 weeks to do this?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this was the year your party was to retake control of the agenda, to prove you could lead.

What did you come up with?

The \$7.2 billion in revenues from writing down REA loans. This scheme from the party that has denounced asset sales in public but can't resist them in conference.

This budget doesn't achieve any real savings.

It includes that hoary old IRS enforcement gimmick which never works.

And most galling to me is that it assumes we will save money on debt interest payments after passage of the Gephardt trade amendment by this House that subsequently kicked market rates up and derailed many American's plans for homeownership.

And what Democrat budget would be complete without a big tax hike.

And \$64 billion over 3 years, we know not where from.

That means either reopening the Tax Reform Act or massively increasing excise taxes that punish the less fortunate.

In the end, the taxes won't happen, but the spending will and will just be added to the deficit.

In the end, the reconciliation bill won't reconcile anything, the continuing resolution will continue everything, and the fiscal integrity

that is the foundation of our liberty will suffer another body blow.

And I cannot help but wonder how much more we can take.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DAUB].

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that this budget is antieducation, it is antielderly, it is antihealth care, and it is antifarmer. I thought that my colleagues who now control both Houses, the other body and this one, in presenting the first new product of their legislative career—that is, totally, firmly being in control of the Congress of the United States—could do better than to take a page out of Walter Mondale's book and try to sell a tax increase to the American people. It is 19 billion dollars' worth of new taxes out of a \$1 trillion budget baseline. Surely we could cut \$19 billion out of \$1 trillion spending baseline instead of raising 19 billion dollars' worth of new taxes.

Twelve million new jobs in the last 6 years, 9 million of them paying over \$5 an hour; interest rates that were 21 percent, inflation rates that were 17 percent, and unemployment that was 13. Hardly a very compassionate measure of the legacy of Democratic controlled tax policy in this country for the 4 years prior to Ronald Reagan assuming the leadership of this country.

□ 1405

From 1966 to 1972 and from 1980 to 1986, if you measure the percent of tax increase as it relates to the percent of deficit, you will find that every time we raise taxes the deficit grows, it does not reduce itself.

The only way to increase the potential for a deficit reduction is by increasing the productivity of America or by cutting spending. History is clear. Churchill said if you know it you can make it. If you ignore it you do so at your peril.

Every time Democrat controlled Congresses have raised taxes, the deficits have increased, not decreased.

This budget resolution is bad policy, bad economics and will end up to be bad politics. I cannot say that I am sorry to see the protax lobby find out at the polls how bad politically their protax position will be, but I hate to see this country pay for it through such folly from the loss of jobs, less growth and higher inflation.

Mr. Speaker, this flies in the face of recent history. There is a direct correlation between recent tax increases and deficit growth.

From 1966-72 the average tax rate was 17.25 percent. The deficit was 0.9 percent of GNP. From 1972-79 the average tax rate went up to 18.48 percent. Despite higher taxes, the deficit as a percent of GNP doubled to 1.8 percent.

From 1980-86 taxes went up to a 19.8 percent average rate. Contrary to what the protax lobby would have us believe, higher taxes

were again accompanied by a large deficit increase. In fact, higher taxes coincided with the highest deficit growth we've had. The deficit has quadrupled to 4 percent of GNP during this latest tax rise.

In spite of this evidence, the protax lobby insists that increasing taxes by \$65 billion over the next 3 years will finally resolve the deficit. This just isn't true.

Economic growth brings in additional tax receipts without raising rates. In fact, with 3.5 percent growth we will have about \$75 billion in additional receipts. However, this growth isn't enough for the protax party. They want to add \$20 billion this year and \$65 billion over 3 years.

Let's vote down this tax increase.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I just got a good laugh out of the last speech that we just heard, and I hope my colleagues will pay some attention to what I say.

Yes, we are living well, interest rates are down, employment is up, everything is fine. It is no problem living on borrowed money.

The trouble is we are borrowing it from our children and our grandchildren. That is the legacy of the Reagan administration.

Sure, everything is fine, we are doing real well. None of us have ever lived better, but who is going to pay the bill? The poor people that are saddled with that increase in the budget deficit, the debt that is subject to regulation of \$1.3 trillion.

All that the Reagan administration has done for all of this peace and prosperity right now is to pass on the requirement to pay for it to our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, this rule is unworthy of our votes. Notwithstanding the other flaws, such as waivers, it ought to be voted down simply because it makes in order what is probably the worst budget that has ever been presented on the floor of this House.

We have used fake numbers which we know are not any good. We have built on false numbers of last year which we knew were not any good. We have increased spending with the exception of national security which we have effectively now frozen for the third straight year. Would that we had the courage to freeze everything else for 3 straight years. And worst of all, we have now added another \$20 billion of tax revenues, or nearly \$65 billion over 3 years.

The House is obviously ruled by the dead hand of Walter Mondale. It not only likes taxes; it is fascinated by

them. The very thought of raising taxes causes many majority Members to salivate.

The Democrats have added new starts into this budget, and that is one reason that they need the new taxation. The budget has more new spending in it than it has total tax money. The net result is that we have spent this year, as we have spent in every other year, all of the new tax money that is provided. None of the increased taxes goes to reduce the deficit.

There has been talk about saving by reducing spending. The real savings are minuscule. By the time you take out the sale of assets and the user fees and the other usual scams, and you come to reconcile savings, there is less than \$4 billion.

It is almost impossible to labor all year and produce such scant savings. It is as though we did not meet at all. There was almost no reason to be here because all we could save was \$3½ billion out of our huge trillion-dollar budget. This Democrat budget achieves less than one-tenth of the spending reductions required to put our country on the right track again.

Parenthetically, I bet very few Members know there is \$100 million in this budget to pay for Senators to be able to reelect themselves. So, all of you who would like to give money to the Senate, be sure and vote for this budget. In so doing you will be gratifying the Senate majority. It needs the money.

Our Democrat friends have said that the President is intransigent, that he is recalcitrant, and that he will not negotiate with them. Can my colleagues imagine that he should agree to taxes which he does not think make any sense? Should he help the spenders pay for their new spending programs, the new starts that they will bring forward in reconciliation, and the increases that they have given to the old programs?

Did they accept any of the President's ideas? Of course not. They said his budget was dead on arrival. And they accepted almost none of his rescissions. Over the years, Congress has approved less than 2 percent of President Reagan's rescissions.

Obviously, the recalcitrance is here. It is the majority leadership of this House which is intransigent. On their record, the House Democrats all are frozen in concrete.

We do not have a process problem. We do not have a problem in the White House. We have a problem right here in the House of Representatives. It is not the procedures that do not work, it is the membership that does not work.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.



Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take the entire time, but let me just say that I encourage everyone, Democrats and Republicans, to support the rule and to support the budget resolution.

Fortunately, I guess, or unfortunately, one way or the other, someone has to govern this country, and we have chosen to ask the people to let us do so, and they have. Based on that, I think the only responsible thing to do is to support this budget.

Sure, there are a lot of things in the budget that I would rather have another way, and I am sure anyone in this body can say that. But it does give us a blueprint to move through with a 1988 budget that this Nation must have, and I ask everyone to vote for the rule and for the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 179, not voting 9, as follows:

## [Roll No. 202]

## YEAS—245

Ackerman	Coelho	Garcia
Akaka	Coleman (TX)	Gaydos
Alexander	Collins	Gejdenson
Anderson	Conyers	Gibbons
Andrews	Cooper	Glickman
Annunzio	Coyne	Gonzalez
Anthony	Crockett	Gordon
Applegate	Darden	Grant
Aspin	de la Garza	Gray (IL)
Atkins	DeFazio	Gray (PA)
AuCoin	Dellums	Guarini
Barnard	Derrick	Hall (OH)
Bates	Dicks	Hall (TX)
Beilenson	Dingell	Hamilton
Bennett	Dixon	Harris
Berman	Donnelly	Hatcher
Bevill	Dorgan (ND)	Hawkins
Biaggi	Dowdy	Hayes (IL)
Bilbray	Downey	Hefner
Boggs	Durbin	Hertel
Boland	Dwyer	Hochbrueckner
Bonker	Dyson	Howard
Borski	Early	Hoyer
Bosco	Eckart	Hubbard
Boucher	Edwards (CA)	Hughes
Boxer	English	Hutto
Brennan	Erdreich	Jenkins
Brooks	Espy	Johnson (SD)
Brown (CA)	Evans	Jones (NC)
Bruce	Fascell	Jones (TN)
Bryant	Fazio	Jontz
Bustamante	Feighan	Kanjorski
Byron	Flake	Kaptur
Campbell	Flippo	Kastenmeier
Cardin	Florio	Kennedy
Carper	Foglietta	Kennelly
Carr	Foley	Kildee
Chapman	Ford (MI)	Klecicka
Chappell	Ford (TN)	Kolter
Clarke	Frank	Kostmayer
Clay	Frost	LaFalce

Lancaster	Nowak	Slattery
Lantos	Oakar	Slaughter (NY)
Leath (TX)	Oberstar	Smith (FL)
Lehman (CA)	Obey	Smith (IA)
Lehman (FL)	Olin	Solomaz
Leland	Ortiz	Spratt
Levin (MI)	Owens (NY)	St Germain
Levine (CA)	Owens (UT)	Staggers
Lewis (GA)	Panetta	Stallings
Lipinski	Patterson	Stark
Lloyd	Pease	Stenholm
Lowry (WA)	Pelosi	Stokes
Lukens, Thomas	Penny	Stratton
MacKay	Pepper	Studds
Manton	Perkins	Swift
Markey	Pickett	Synar
Martinez	Pickle	Tallon
Matsui	Price (IL)	Thomas (GA)
Mavroules	Price (NC)	Torres
Mazzoli	Rahall	Torricelli
McCloskey	Rangel	Towns
McCurdy	Richardson	Trafficant
McHugh	Robinson	Traxler
McMillen (MD)	Rodino	Udall
Mfume	Roe	Valentine
Mica	Rose	Vento
Miller (CA)	Rostenkowski	Visclosky
Mineta	Rowland (GA)	Volkmer
Moakley	Roybal	Walgren
Mollohan	Russo	Watkins
Montgomery	Sabo	Waxman
Moody	Savage	Weiss
Morrison (CT)	Sawyer	Wheat
Mrazek	Scheuer	Whitten
Murphy	Schroeder	Williams
Murtha	Schumer	Wilson
Nagle	Sharp	Wise
Natcher	Sikorski	Wolpe
Neal	Siskis	Wyden
Nelson	Skaggs	Yatron
Nichols	Skelton	

## NAYS—179

Archer	Gingrich	McDade
Armey	Goodling	McEwen
Baker	Gradison	McGrath
Ballenger	Grandy	McMillan (NC)
Bartlett	Green	Meyers
Barton	Gregg	Michel
Bateman	Gunderson	Miller (OH)
Bentley	Hammerschmidt	Miller (WA)
Bereuter	Hansen	Molinar
Bilirakis	Hastert	Moorhead
Billie	Hayes (LA)	Morella
Boehlert	Hefley	Morrison (WA)
Boulter	Henry	Myers
Broomfield	Herger	Nielson
Brown (CO)	Hiler	Oxley
Buechner	Holloway	Parris
Bunning	Hopkins	Pashayan
Burton	Horton	Petri
Callahan	Houghton	Porter
Chandler	Huckaby	Pursell
Cheney	Hunter	Quillen
Clinger	Hyde	Ravenel
Coats	Inhofe	Regula
Coble	Ireland	Rhodes
Coleman (MO)	Jacobs	Ridge
Combest	Jeffords	Rinaldo
Conte	Johnson (CT)	Ritter
Coughlin	Kasich	Roberts
Courter	Kemp	Roemer
Craig	Kolbe	Rogers
Crane	Konnyu	Roth
Dannemeyer	Kyl	Roukema
Daub	Lagomarsino	Rowland (CT)
Davis (IL)	Latta	Saiki
Davis (MI)	Leach (IA)	Saxton
DeLay	Lent	Schaefer
DeWine	Lewis (CA)	Schneider
Dickinson	Lewis (FL)	Schuetz
DioGuardi	Lightfoot	Schulze
Dornan (CA)	Livingston	Sensenbrenner
Dreier	Lott	Shaw
Duncan	Lowery (CA)	Shumway
Edwards (OK)	Lujan	Shuster
Emerson	Lukens, Donald	Skeen
Fawell	Lungren	Slaughter (VA)
Felds	Mack	Smith (NE)
Fish	Madigan	Smith (NJ)
Frenzel	Marlenee	Smith (TX)
Galleghy	Martin (IL)	Smith, Denny
Gallo	Martin (NY)	(OR)
Gekas	McCandless	Smith, Robert
Gilman	McCollum	(NH)

Smith, Robert	Swindall	Weldon
(OR)	Tauke	Whittaker
Snowe	Taylor	Wolf
Solomon	Thomas (CA)	Wortley
Spence	Upton	Wyllie
Stangeland	Vander Jagt	Yates
Stump	Vucanovich	Young (AK)
Sundquist	Walker	Young (FL)
Sweeney	Weber	

## NOT VOTING—9

Badham	Daniel	Packard
Boner (TN)	Dymally	Ray
Bonior (MI)	Gephardt	Tauzin

## □ 1435

Mr. BENNETT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Pursuant to House Resolution 201, House Resolution 197 implementing budget procedures in the House of Representatives for fiscal year 1988 is hereby laid on the table.

# WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2712, INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION, 1988

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 206 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 206

*Resolved*, That all points of order for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI and clause 7 of rule XXI are hereby waived against the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2712) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988, and for other purposes. During the consideration of the bill, all points of order against the following provisions of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived: beginning on page 2, lines 1 through 24; beginning on page 4, line 7 through page 6, line 5; beginning on page 7, line 19 through page 9, line 2; beginning on page 12, line 12 through page 13, line 5; beginning on page 13, lines 23 through 26; beginning on page 16, lines 3 through 21; beginning on page 18, line 3 through page 19, line 6; beginning on page 38, line 14 through page 40, line 2; beginning on page 46, line 23 through page 53, line 3; beginning on page 55, line 1 through page 57, line 11; beginning on page 61, line 1 through page 62, line 3; beginning on page 70, lines 1 through 21; and beginning on page 71, lines 5 through 15.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TAYLOR], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 206 is a rule to facilitate consideration of H.R. 2712, the bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1988.

Since general appropriations bills are privileged, the rule does not provide any special procedures for consideration of the bill. The bill will be considered under the normal legislative process for appropriations bills. The time devoted to general debate will be determined by a unanimous-consent request. Additionally, the bill will be open to amendment under the 5-minute rule. Any amendment which does not violate the rules of the House will be in order.

All points of order against the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI are waived. This provision requires that committee reports be made available to Members 3 days prior to consideration on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also waives clause 7 of rule XXI which requires that relevant printed hearings and reports on appropriations bills be available 3 days prior to House consideration. While reports for this measure were filed on June 18, printed copies of hearings have been available since June 17.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI which prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions in general appropriations bills. The precise provisions of H.R. 2712, for which the waivers are provided, are detailed in the rule by reference to page and line numbers in the appropriations bill.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee supports these waivers.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2712 provides appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies including the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, historic preservation funds as well as the strategic petroleum reserve.

Many of the committee's initiatives relate to the protection of natural resources on public lands, development of new energy sources and continued commitment to conserve our natural heritage. Many of the programs funded in this bill have an impact on our daily lives.

Mr. Speaker, more than a century ago Congress established the National Park System to protect our lands, water, and wildlife for the enjoyment of future generations of Americans. Funding for the Park Service's Land Acquisition Program contained in this bill continues this proud tradition. This year alone, the Park Service estimates that 360 million Americans will visit the over 300 parks throughout the United States.

Funding for the Historic Preservation Program provides State grants to prevent the destruction of historically significant buildings in our local communities.

In the area of clean coal technology, the committee provides funding for projects helping industries develop technologies to burn coal more efficiently and with less pollution.

Mr. Speaker, the Interior appropriations bill enjoys widespread support largely due to the work of the distinguished chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, Mr. YATES, and the ranking minority member, Mr. REGULA. Mr. YATES has ably served as chairman since 1975 and has gained the respect of the Members of this Chamber for his strong leadership and unwavering support for the arts, efforts to preserve our environment and developing alternative energy sources.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to adopt this rule and support this appropriations measure.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 206 is a rule waiving various points of order against consideration of a bill which appropriates \$9.4 billion in new budget authority in fiscal 1988 for management preservation of our Nation's natural resources.

The rule waives points of order against the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal 1988, H.R. 2712.

The rule is necessary in order to allow timely consideration of the bill. It therefore waives points of order that would otherwise lie against the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XI and clause 7 of rule XXI.

Mr. Speaker, clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI requires reported bills to be available for at least 3 calendar days prior to consideration in the House. Clause 7 of rule XXI requires printed committee hearings and a committee report to be available for at least 3 calendar days prior to consideration of a general appropriation bill in the House.

In the case of the fiscal 1988 appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, the Committee on Appropriations filed the reported bill only last Thursday, June 18.

The leadership wants to bring the bill up later today, and these two waivers are included in the rule because of the floor schedule. The Appropriations Committee was asked by the leadership to be ready today, and the Rules Committee is providing the necessary waivers to facilitate House consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2712 appropriates \$9.4 billion for the Interior Department and related agencies for 1988. The bill is \$1.1 billion more than was appropriated for these programs in fiscal 1987, and is \$1.5 billion higher

than the budget request of the administration.

Among the major budget increases are: \$633.3 million more than requested for Energy Department programs; \$438.3 million more than requested for the Interior Department; \$214.1 million more than requested for Indian health care programs; and \$209.5 million more than requested for the Forest Service.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also waives points of order that would otherwise lie against 16 specified provisions of the bill, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI.

Clause 2 of rule XXI prohibits appropriations for any expenditure not previously authorized by law and also prohibits legislation on an appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, the waivers recommended by the Committee on Rules are necessary because the specific provisions have either not been authorized by law or do constitute legislation.

I shall not detail each provision for which we have waived clause 2 of rule XXI, but I do ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] outlining and explaining the need for these waivers.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has notified the Committee on Rules that it opposes H.R. 2712 in its present form. I shall not detail the specific objections raised by the Office of Management and Budget, but I do ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point extraneous material, which is the statement we received from the administration.

Mr. Speaker, both the chairman and ranking Republican member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee appeared last Thursday before the Rules Committee to request the waivers provided in this rule. I want to extend my congratulations to both the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] for their balanced approach to this bill.

H.R. 2712 balances our energy conservation, research and development policies with long-standing stewardship requirements the Congress has followed in order to preserve our Nation's great natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by mentioning that the rule does not preclude Members from offering amendments to reduce funds in specific accounts, or any germane limitation amendments.

Members who have amendments, or who want to lower new budget authority amounts should support this rule so that the House can proceed to consider the bill.



COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
Washington, DC, June 18, 1987.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,

Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Appropriations on June 18 reported the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988.

It has become necessary, in order to meet deadlines, that we include appropriations for a number of programs for which legislation has not yet been enacted and several legislative provisions for which a waiver of Clause 2, Rule XXI is requested. With respect to the lack of authorization for appropriations, representatives of the legislative committees of jurisdiction have been contacted and we know of no objections. We are also asking for a limited number of waivers for legislative provisions contained in the bill. At this time we know of no objections to them by the committees of jurisdiction. A list of specific requests for waivers is enclosed.

In addition to those items of which you were apprised previously, the Committee requests a waiver of Clause 2, Rule XXI for a legislative provision, which was inadvertently omitted from the list provided. Section 302, Title III—General provisions prohibits the sale of unprocessed lumber from certain Federal lands for export or for substitution for private timber which is exported.

The Committee appreciates your continued cooperation.

Sincerely,

JAMIE WHITTEN,  
Chairman.

Enclosures.

REQUESTS FOR WAIVER OF CLAUSE 2, RULE XXI—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1988

1. Bureau of Land Management, Management of lands and resources; construction and access; range improvements; service charges, deposits and forfeitures; and miscellaneous trust funds. The Committee recommends a total appropriation of \$511,431,000 for these programs, which were authorized through fiscal year 1984. To date, legislation to begin providing specific annual authorization again has not been introduced in the House.

2. United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Resource Management. The Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$335,524,000 for this account, including \$30,670,000 for Endangered Species. Legislation authorizing \$35,000,000 for Endangered Species (HR 1467) has been introduced and referred to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

3. United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Construction and Anadromous Fish. The Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$21,054,000 for this account, including \$2,000,000 for anadromous fish grants. No authorizing legislation for anadromous fish grants has been introduced in the House.

4. National Park Service, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$4,920,000. Congress has periodically extended the authorization for the Center, but no authorization legislation currently is pending.

5. Geological Survey, surveys, investigations, and research. The Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$447,324,000

for this account, including \$35,040,000 for earthquake hazards reduction. Legislation authorizing \$36,540,000 for earthquake hazards reduction (HR 1612) passed the House on June 8, 1987.

6. Department of Energy, Fossil energy research and development; Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves; energy conservation; economic regulation; emergency preparedness; Strategic Petroleum Reserve; SPR petroleum account; and Energy Information Administration. The Committee recommends a total appropriation of \$1,688,662,000 for these programs. \$291,000,000 out of \$603,744,000 for the SPR petroleum account was authorized by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986 (PL 99-509), and \$157,692,000 for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is authorized by PL 99-272, the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985. The remaining amounts are ongoing programs of the Department for which annual authorizing legislation has not been reported in the House.

7. Department of Health and Human Services, Indian Health Services. The Committee recommends a total appropriation of \$943,388,000 for Indian health services. Included in this total is \$9,424,000 for urban health projects and \$7,646,000 for Indian health manpower, which were authorized by the Indian Health Care Improvement Act. Reauthorization for those programs is contained in HR 2290 reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Committee on Energy and Commerce has yet to report the bill.

8. Department of Education, Indian Education. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$66,343,000 for Indian education. Included is \$63,877,000 for Parts A, B, and C of the Indian Education Act, authorization for which is contained in HR 5 which passed the House on May 21, 1987.

9. Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission, Salaries and expenses. The Committee recommends a total appropriation of \$25,270,000 for the Commission. Of that amount \$18,800,000 for housing and home repair is not authorized. No authorizing legislation has been introduced in the House.

10. United States Holocaust Memorial Council. The Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$2,145,000 for the Council. No authorizing legislation has been introduced in the House.

For items 1 through 10 a waiver of Clause 2 of the Rule XXI is requested, because of lack of annual authorization.

In addition, a waiver of Clause 2 of Rule XXI is requested for the following legislative provisions:

11. National Park Service, Construction. This section provides not to exceed \$300,000 for assistance to Mariposa County, California, for a solid waste disposal facility which would serve Yosemite National Park. This type of assistance is not specifically authorized.

12. Minerals Management Service, Leasing and royalty management. This section changes the basis of the distribution of minerals receipts to States.

13. Forest Service, Administrative provisions, forest service. A paragraph within Administrative provisions places a ceiling on amounts available for timber supply from, protection and management, and resource protection on the Tongass National Forest.

14. Department of Energy, Clean coal technology. This section provides for a solicitation of projects for coal technologies to reduce pollution from existing facilities,

under specific conditions. The overall clean coal technology program is authorized.

15. Title III—General provisions, Section 302. This section prohibits the sale of unprocessed lumber from certain Federal lands for export or for substitution for private timber which is exported.

#### INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1988

1. On page 24, line 7, strike "\$965,956,000" and insert "\$966,452,000".

2. On page 27, line 20, strike "\$1,282,000" and insert "\$1,482,000".

3. On page 47, strike lines 4 through 8.

4. Beginning on page 47, line 18, strike all through page 47, line 21, and insert: "\$50,000,000 are appropriated for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1987, and shall remain available until expended, \$200,000,000 are appropriated for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1988, and shall remain available until expended, and \$100,000,000 are appropriated for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1989, and shall remain available until expended."

5. On page 47, line 13, before the period, add "in fiscal year 1988".

6. On page 77, strike line 11 and all lines that follow through page 78, line 4.

#### STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(H.R.—Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 1988 (Sponsor: Yates (D), Illinois))

The bill is unacceptable to the Administration. If the bill were presented to the President in its present form, the President's senior advisers would recommend that he veto it.

The Administration is pleased that the Committee has once again approved the concept of deducting Federal administrative costs before distributing Federal onshore mineral leasing receipts between the States and the Treasury. The Administration also is pleased that additional funding has been provided for the Clean Coal Technology Program, but urges the House to amend the bill to restore the full five-year, \$2.5 billion funding mechanism requested by the Administration, in order to fulfill the United States' commitment to Canada to implement the recommendations of the Special Envoys on Acid Rain. Finally, we are pleased that the Committee has provided funds for sustaining a 75,000 barrel per day fill rate for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve even though this is less than the President's recent energy security recommendations to Congress supporting a 100,000 barrel per day fill rate provided that budget offsets are made available to cover its higher costs.

Nevertheless, the bill is unacceptable, and if the bill were presented to the President in its present form, the President's senior advisers would recommend that he veto it. In considering the acceptability of Congressional action on appropriations bills, the Administration will use as its benchmark the budgetary resources (i.e., budget authority, obligation limitations, and loan limitations) requested by the President for discretionary programs. The Committee's action exceeds that benchmark by \$1.8 billion. The major increases over the levels included in the President's Budget are for items that can be easily delayed or are of a purely local rather than national interest. The national importance of achieving the deficit reduction targets of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings vastly outweighs the marginal value of these increases.

Of particular concern to the Administration are:

An unwarranted increase of \$327 million (41 percent) for the Indian Health Service, including increases for contract care (fees for which in reality are declining), unnecessary hospital facilities, and sanitation facilities funded more appropriately elsewhere.

Increases of \$194 million (130 percent) in Fossil energy research and development and \$240 million (80 percent) in Energy conservation, which would finance programs that are properly the responsibility of, and that should be supported by, the private sector and/or State governments. In particular, the Administration urges no funding for conservation grants since States have received large settlements from Exxon Corporation and other overcharges.

Numerous small increments to the President's Budget. The Committee added small amounts of money for a large number of items that are of low priority or can be delayed easily (such as grants to States for recreation programs and land acquisition) or are of a purely local rather than national interest (park, fish, and wildlife, and Indian construction projects; demonstration, research and technology projects; and support of the arts in Washington, D.C.). The result is a rather large increase that should be reduced by the full Committee.

Moreover, the bill contains a number of objectionable language provisions. The most troublesome of these relates to Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) leasing activities off the East coast. This provision would threaten our future energy security by placing large OCS areas off limits to leasing. By refusing to allow responsible and environmentally safe study and exploration of our most promising OCS areas, the Committee action will surely increase our dependence on foreign sources of oil. The Administration is also strongly opposed to the requirement that structures on the OCS contain at least 50 percent U.S. materials.

Other provisions in the bill overstep legislative functions (particularly those enunciated by the Supreme Court in *INS v. Chadha*) by requiring Congressional Committee approval of Executive Branch actions and impede the ability of the Executive Branch to manage properly and effectively its responsibilities. The most objectionable provisions involve micromangement instructions (the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Mines, the Mineral Management Service, and the Office of Surface Mining), and exemptions from personnel ceilings necessary for prudent management of the Executive Branch by the President. We strongly oppose efforts to infringe upon the constitutional authority and legitimate policy and managerial functions of the Executive Branch.

It is crucial to the efficient management of the Nation's affairs that mutually acceptable decisions be made expeditiously in the budget process generally and the appropriations process in particular. It is equally important that these decisions support both national priorities and the fiscal restraint required by the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act. The Administration is prepared to work with Congress toward these ends.

The Administration urges the House to eliminate the unwarranted spending increases and objectionable language provisions in the bill so that the President's senior advisers could recommend that he sign it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for an inquiry that he would like to make regarding this rule.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wanted to inquire of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK]. The rule makes in order, as I understand it, consideration of the bill as printed, is that correct?

Mr. DERRICK. That is correct.

Mr. WALKER. That is H.R. 2712, Union Calendar No. 98?

Mr. DERRICK. That is right.

Mr. WALKER. I went through here, and I found a little bit of a problem in trying to figure out what we were waiving, because as I went through the bill as printed, when I got to the beginning on page 70, lines 1 through 21, the bill as printed has no page 70 in it.

Instead, the bill as printed evidently starts and begins taking up the legislative appropriation bill at page 17, after page 64 in the bill?

Mr. DERRICK. The gentleman must have a copy that has been misprinted. I have a copy that has a page 70.

Mr. WALKER. I have a copy here. Maybe the minority has been supplied with incorrect bills here, but I just went back here and pulled a bunch of them off the stack in the back here.

Mr. DERRICK. We have not been reduced to that yet, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DERRICK. It is apparently simply a printing error, but we have copies available.

□ 1450

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, are we assured that in fact the waivers made in order under the rule do in fact match up with the bill, so that we are in fact approving a rule that speaks to the bill as printed?

Mr. DERRICK. The gentleman has my assurance.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman, and I will tell the gentleman that there evidently has been a fairly serious printing error, because there are pages missing. The Legislative Appropriations Act has been inserted in the middle of the Interior Appropriations Act and it is going to cause some confusion to people who come on the floor and try to look through the bill, so we had better make certain we have the right bill.

Mr. DERRICK. Well, I apologize to the gentleman. The gentleman has apparently found a mistake that we made.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I think we ought to warn our colleagues that when they pick up a copy of the bill, they had better make certain they have the right bill, because there are

some of them here that are bad, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for calling attention to the error that has obviously been made in the printing of these bills. I think it is well that it has been called to the attention of the body.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 322, nays 100, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

YEAS—322

Ackerman	Coleman (TX)	Frost
Akaka	Collins	Garcia
Alexander	Combest	Gaydos
Anderson	Conte	Geddeson
Andrews	Conyers	Gibbons
Annunzio	Cooper	Gilman
Anthony	Coughlin	Glickman
Applegate	Courter	Gonzalez
Aspin	Coyne	Goodling
Atkins	Craig	Gordon
AuCoin	Crockett	Gradison
Barnard	Darden	Grant
Bateman	Davis (MI)	Gray (IL)
Bates	De la Garza	Gray (PA)
Beilenson	DeFazio	Green
Bennett	Dellums	Guarini
Bereuter	Derrick	Hall (OH)
Berman	Dicks	Hall (TX)
Bevill	Dingell	Hamilton
Biaggi	DiGuardi	Hammerschmidt
Bilbray	Dixon	Harris
Boehlert	Donnelly	Hatcher
Boggs	Dorgan (ND)	Hawkins
Boland	Dowdy	Hayes (IL)
Bonker	Downey	Hayes (LA)
Borski	Duncan	Hefner
Bosco	Durbin	Herger
Boucher	Dwyer	Hertel
Boxer	Dyson	Hochbrueckner
Brennan	Early	Horton
Brooks	Eckart	Howard
Broomfield	Edwards (CA)	Hoyer
Brown (CA)	Emerson	Hubbard
Bruce	English	Hughes
Bryant	Erdreich	Hutto
Bustamante	Espy	Ireland
Byron	Evans	Jacobs
Campbell	Fascell	Jeffords
Cardin	Fazio	Jenkins
Carper	Feighan	Johnson (CT)
Carr	Fish	Johnson (SD)
Chapman	Flake	Jones (NC)
Chappell	Flipppo	Jones (TN)
Clarke	Florio	Jontz
Clay	Foglietta	Kanjorski
Clinger	Foley	Kaptur
Coats	Ford (MI)	Kastenmeier
Coelho	Ford (TN)	Kennedy
Coleman (MO)	Frank	Kennelly



Kildee	Nagle	Sisisky
Kiecicka	Natcher	Skaggs
Kolbe	Neal	Skelton
Kolter	Nelson	Slattery
Konnyu	Nichols	Slaughter (NY)
Kostmayer	Nielson	Smith (FL)
Kyl	Nowak	Smith (IA)
LaFalce	Oakar	Smith (NE)
Lancaster	Oberstar	Smith (NJ)
Lantos	Obey	Smith (TX)
Latta	Olin	Smith, Robert
Leach (IA)	Ortiz	(OR)
Leath (TX)	Owens (NY)	Snowe
Lehman (CA)	Owens (UT)	Solarz
Lehman (FL)	Panetta	Spratt
Leland	Parris	St Germain
Lent	Pashayan	Staggers
Levin (MI)	Patterson	Stallings
Levine (CA)	Pease	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Pelosi	Stenholm
Lipinski	Penny	Stokes
Livingston	Pepper	Stratton
Lloyd	Perkins	Studds
Lowery (CA)	Pickett	Stump
Lowry (WA)	Pickle	Sundquist
Lukens, Thomas	Price (IL)	Swift
MacKay	Price (NC)	Synar
Manton	Quillen	Tallon
Markey	Rahall	Taylor
Marlenee	Rangel	Thomas (GA)
Martin (NY)	Ravenel	Torres
Martinez	Regula	Torricelli
Matsui	Rhodes	Towns
Mavroules	Richardson	Traficant
Mazzoli	Rinaldo	Traxler
McCloskey	Ritter	Udall
McCurdy	Robinson	Valentine
McDade	Rodino	Vento
McGrath	Roe	Visclosky
McHugh	Rogers	Volkmer
McMillen (MD)	Rose	Walgren
Meyers	Rostenkowski	Watkins
Mfume	Roukema	Waxman
Mica	Rowland (CT)	Weiss
Miller (CA)	Rowland (GA)	Wheat
Miller (OH)	Roybal	Whittaker
Mineta	Russo	Whitten
Moakley	Sabo	Williams
Molinari	Savage	Wilson
Mollohan	Sawyer	Wise
Montgomery	Saxton	Wolf
Moody	Scheuer	Wolpe
Morella	Schneider	Wortley
Morrison (CT)	Schroeder	Wyden
Morrison (WA)	Schulze	Wyllie
Mrazek	Schumer	Yates
Murphy	Sharp	Yatron
Murtha	Shaw	Young (FL)
Myers	Sikorski	

## NAYS—100

Archer	Grandy	Oxley
Armey	Gregg	Petri
Baker	Gunderson	Porter
Ballenger	Hansen	Pursell
Bartlett	Hastert	Ridge
Barton	Hefley	Roberts
Bentley	Henry	Roemer
Billirakis	Hiler	Roth
Billey	Holloway	Saiki
Boulter	Hopkins	Schaefer
Brown (CO)	Houghton	Schuetz
Bunning	Huckaby	Sensenbrenner
Burton	Hunter	Shumway
Callahan	Hyde	Shuster
Chandler	Inhofe	Skeen
Cheney	Kasich	Slaughter (VA)
Coble	Lagomarsino	Smith, Denny
Crane	Lewis (CA)	(OR)
Dannemeyer	Lewis (FL)	Smith, Robert
Daub	Lightfoot	(NH)
Davis (IL)	Lott	Solomon
DeLay	Lujan	Spence
DeWine	Lukens, Donald	Stangeland
Dickinson	Lungren	Sweeney
Dornan (CA)	Mack	Swindall
Dreier	Madigan	Tauke
Edwards (OK)	Martin (IL)	Thomas (CA)
Fawell	McCandless	Upton
Fields	McCollum	Vander Jagt
Frenzel	McEwen	Vucanovich
Galleghy	McMillan (NC)	Walker
Gallo	Michel	Weber
Gekas	Miller (WA)	Weldon
Gingrich	Moorhead	Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—11

Badham	Daniel	Packard
Boner (TN)	Dymally	Ray
Bonior (MI)	Gephardt	Tauzin
Buechner	Kemp	

## □ 1505

Mr. UPTON and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HERGER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The results of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 93, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1988

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 201, I call up the conference report on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 93) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

## □ 1515

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 201, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Monday, June 22, 1987, at page 16879.)

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for your approval the conference agreement on the budget resolution for fiscal year 1988. The conference that produced this agreement was long and arduous.

In all likelihood, this budget is not the best that any of us might design individually. It was the result of negotiation and compromise. But this agreement does preserve the domestic priorities embodied in the budget resolution we passed more than 2 months ago. In areas like defense and revenues, it is closer to the House version than the Senate's. And it achieves \$36.85 billion in real deficit reductions—under any set of estimating assumptions.

This is a pay-as-you-go plan that allows the President to choose a budget with higher defense spending and greater deficit reduction, or one

with lower defense spending and a larger deficit. The choice is his. There will be no more borrowing to finance his defense program. In effect, we have torn up the President's credit card, and told him he no longer can follow his policy of borrow and borrow, spend and spend.

I believe the House conferees did very well in the negotiations with the Senate. The agreement maintains the figures we assumed in our resolution for emergency national priorities. It includes \$970 million for AIDS research, education, and prevention. It includes an additional \$550 million for assistance to the homeless. And it provides funding for other new initiatives in areas like education, child development, trade, and welfare reform.

As the people's house we stressed the people's priorities in the conference, and we were successful in preserving our funding levels for education, health, Medicare, income security, and community and regional development.

The agreement ties the level of defense spending to the President's acceptance of revenues for deficit reduction. If he signs reconciliation, defense would be funded at \$296 billion in budget authority and \$289.5 billion in outlays. If he doesn't sign reconciliation, defense budget authority would be \$289.0 billion and outlays would be \$283.6 billion.

If the President accepts revenues for deficit reduction, defense spending could grow by \$6 billion in 1988, bringing it nearly to the inflation-adjusted CBO baseline. However, the agreement on budget authority of \$296 billion, contingent on the President's agreement to reconciliation, lowers substantially any commitment to higher defense spending in the out-years.

Finally, we reached agreement on new revenues that are far closer to the figure in the House resolution than the one proposed by the Senate. The Senate resolution called for \$119 billion in new revenues over 4 years—\$18.3 billion the first year, \$30.5 billion the next 2 years, and \$39.5 billion in the final year. Our resolution proposed \$57.0 billion in new revenues over 3 years, with modest year-to-year increases from \$18 to \$19 to \$20 billion.

The agreement calls for \$64.3 billion in new revenues over 3 years—\$19.3 billion the first year, \$22 billion the second, and \$23 billion the third. We believe this lower figure is politically and substantively more realistic than the higher Senate number. Nevertheless, it will reduce substantially both the future deficit problem and the pressure for excessive spending cuts in vitally needed programs.

My friends, this conference agreement deserves the support of all Mem-

bers of this body. It is not only a workable plan that provides for all of the important needs of the Nation—it is a responsible plan. It is a plan that will lead us out of the valley of debt and onto the high ground of fiscal responsibility.

The President has criticized this plan. He says he wants reforms in the budget process before he'll even talk to us about the budget. But it has been 6 months since the President sent us his unrealistic, irresponsible budget proposal, and the American people want to know where this Government is headed.

Just because the President wants to shift attention away from his other troubles, we cannot let ourselves be distracted from the need to put our fiscal house in order. He has Iranscam; we've got to stop the budget scam. He had Contragate; now we have to close the deficit gate.

The American people expect straightforward talk from their elected Representatives. The American people are tired of the President's empty rhetoric—and his empty promises.

When a Presidential candidate promises to balance the budget within 3 years—then more than doubles the national debt in his first 6 years in office—and then has the audacity to renew his call for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget—the American people know they are not being told the truth.

When the President says he wants to reduce the deficit—then sends us a budget that includes new taxes—and then says he'll veto any bill to raise new revenues—the American people know they are not being told the truth.

My friends, this is a budget that reflects the hopes and desires of the American people, their priorities—and their sense of reality.

It's a budget that tells the President there's no free lunch, that we have to begin to pay as we go, not just shift the burden to future generations.

And it's a budget that tells our citizens at home—and our allies abroad—that we are prepared to act responsibly, even when the decisions are difficult.

My friends, these are the messages we need to send, and this budget will send them. I urge your approval.

Is this the absolute best budget in the world? I will be the first to say no, it is not. But it is the best one that we can produce now with the consensus that is available, since our Republican friends are not participating in the process.

I would simply say to those who will stand here today and urge you to vote no, where is their budget? They did not produce one several weeks ago. They still do not have one, and they

voted against their own President's budget.

We need to send a message and that message is that we will make some difficult decisions, we will reduce the deficit by over \$36 billion, and we will achieve a compromise in order to do it.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, chairman of the Budget Committee, for yielding, and want to commend him for the outstanding job he has done as well as the committee.

But I do want to engage in a colloquy now with regard to the actions of the conference committee on the budget resolution. Could the gentleman advise me as to how much this conference report assumes for the international affairs function and how any reductions from current levels for that function would be allocated?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. The conference report assumes \$16.2 billion in budget authority, \$16.1 billion in outlays for that particular function. This represents a reduction of \$150 million in budget authority and \$100 million in outlays from the House-passed version of the budget resolution.

The conference committee did not make any specific assumptions about how program cuts would be allocated except that countries covered by the Camp David agreements are assumed to be protected.

Mr. FASCELL. So the conference committee, in accordance with the House rules and the Budget Act, has given total discretion to the authorizing committees and the Appropriations Committee to allocate any reductions among the numerous authorizations and appropriation measures in the international affairs function?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Florida is absolutely correct. The final allocations of spending will be made by the committees of jurisdiction. They are not made in this budget by the Budget Committee.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman and again want to express my appreciation to him and the members of the Budget Committee for giving us this opportunity. Otherwise, speaking just for our Committee on Foreign Affairs, we would have had a disaster on our hands.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I guess my question is a follow-on or just an expansion. The gentleman from Florida was speaking especially of the State Department and foreign

affairs, but the same answer would apply to all departments, would it not?

Mr. FASCELL. In the 150 account.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. The answer would apply to the 150 account. It would also apply in general in the budget where there are no specific assumptions made that are not reconciled.

As the gentleman well knows, the gentleman was one of those who helped to draft the Budget Act several years ago, the authorizing and appropriation committees make the final assumptions with regard to the allocations specifically unless we specify in reconciliation. We set ceilings, we have set targets, which are not to be exceeded. As the gentleman well knows, we issue reports on those 302(a) ceilings.

So the gentleman's understanding about the budget would be correct.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] has consumed 11 minutes.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DENNY SMITH].

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, this debate has posed the question of which is better—tax and spend or borrow and spend—nobody has stood up and said "Why not just cut spending?"

Deficit projections for fiscal 1988 and the outyears are guesses at best. This Democrat document is official certification by the majority party in this Congress that Gramm-Rudman is dead in law and spirit. This document will be ignored at the first opportunity, points of order will be waived, and this 5 weeks of waiting and doing nothing will have gone for nothing.

This budget is a sham document. The numbers are "cooked" and everyone here knows it.

The test of the budget document is not the rhetoric of today, it is when appropriation measures come before the House and we choose to forget about our fiscal responsibility speeches.

The test is when we have late-night sessions to pass a continuing resolution to fund the Government because the majority party has been unable or unwilling to pass appropriation measures.

Unfortunately, the Congress has failed this test year after year.

The majority talks of taking the leadership role on the issue of the budget. Their idea of leadership is to bite their lip and vote to waive points of order against budget act violations—something they did 106 times last year.



We listen to these speeches from the other side of the aisle regarding their fiscal responsibility; we hear of these cuts that have been imposed on so many programs; how they held back the rate of increase in defense spending and tied it to a tax increase; nondefense items didn't have that tax increase threat attached.

The facts of this document are clear—spending will go up next year, taxes will go up next year, and not one nondefense program has been cut from the budget. This is not the type of leadership this country needs.

Department of the Interior appropriations is due to come before this body today. Interior functions for fiscal year 1988 are scheduled to increase by 13.6 percent. Related agencies alone are scheduled to increase by 23.3 percent over the fiscal year 1987 figures.

The energy and water appropriations for fiscal year 1988 is scheduled to increase over fiscal year 1987 by 7.6 percent.

When I first came to Congress, spending for fiscal year 1981 was \$688 billion. For fiscal year 1988 the Democrats propose spending \$1.041 trillion—a 51-percent increase.

Receipts for fiscal year 1981 totaled \$559 billion. In fiscal year 1988 we are asked to accept \$933 billion—a 56-percent increase, yet deficits increased from \$79 billion in fiscal year 1981; \$165 to \$175 billion in fiscal year 1989; and roughly the same figures for fiscal year 1988.

We are asked to accept another \$19.3 billion in unspecified taxes as a way of closing the deficit. Over the past 50 years, Congress has enacted about 200 bills that have increased taxes in some way—leadership means having to make decisions and sometimes saying “no.”

Sixty-five billion dollar figure for 3 years is not accurate—does not reflect the costs of welfare reform or catastrophic health insurance; does not reflect the loss of revenue to the Government by forcing businesses to close and taking more money from the taxpayers' pockets.

I urge a “no” vote on this sham budget.

□ 1530

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address this conversation where people are saying that this budget is a sham. First of all, how did we get here? If we do a real reality check, the way we got here is America bought a “hot fudge sundae diet” about 7 years ago.

Now, I like hot fudge sundae diets, but here we are today saying, “Hey, the diet didn't work.”

We were told that you could cut taxes, increase defense and balance the budget. And we just finished coming back from the Venice conference as the biggest debtor in the world. So the question is are we going to do anything about it? I really salute the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his committee who have worked very hard to put a budget out here. It gives two different options. If the President wants more defense than he can pay for more defense, and pay as you go is the only way when you are running the kind of deficits we are running. It is the only way. We cannot keep letting the deficit mount up and we are going to still be paying it off in the 21st century, which is a very sobering thing.

So we are going to hear all sorts of people stand up today and say, “Oh, what we should have done is cut spending.” Yes, well where is that budget to cut the spending? I do not think anybody should be allowed to say that unless they had a budget that was out here.

As I remember when this budget was going there were not a lot of options. Everybody wanted to take a hit on what you put on the table but nobody wanted to go put the hard options on the table.

So I think we have got a great budget here that says there are two hard options; the President can pick from column A or column B and the “hot fudge sundae diet” did not work.

I think we really need to get on with that rather than kidding ourselves that we can keep doing this with smoke and mirrors, with tap dances, with anything else.

We have got to get it turned around. It is affecting our trade internationally, it is certainly affecting the different options of what we can do in the future and I think everybody should vote for this budget.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, we all have heard or we have used the term “better late than never.” But I am afraid in the case of this budget conference resolution “never” might have been better for the American public than “never.”

Now, “never” might have been better by all means. During our one meeting, we had three, but two were to get the speeches that we heard every year. When that was finished we had one more budget meeting where the minority was invited.

During that time we heard the term over and over again, “We can't continue to borrow and spend.” I agree with that. That is a bad policy. But what they also said, they did not put it in

writing, but we will continue the business of taxing and spend.

Then they said, “Mr. President, pay as you go.” That is a good policy; I agree with that. The fastest growing part of our budget, if you look at each one individually, happens to be one on the domestic side. And I notice we are not paying as we go on the domestic side.

To the public: I am sorry we did not meet \$108 billion as a deficit. I did not believe that we could. I happen to be one of those who did not think it was realistic.

But I am also sorry we did not meet \$134 billion or \$136 billion. We said we played around with REA, we were getting all sorts of money from that but CBO says that it is not true. Then we get to reconciliation and what do we do? Then we have supplementals, then we have continuing resolutions.

Then my chairman says, “We are now coming out of the shadow of the valley of death.” And I say, “Yes, right into the shadow of the valley of death, economic death.”

Truly, public, I apologize that as part of this committee we are presenting you a scam one more time.

I thought we might do it last year because it was an election year. I had hoped this year we would not do it because it was a nonelection year. But, public, do not lose faith; perhaps next year we will have the courage to do what has to be done and we will pay as we go on all programs, not just certain programs.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the deficit must be reduced. There is no disagreement on this point.

Continued record deficits are a threat to the economy and the single biggest reason for our trade deficit and our growing foreign debt. There isn't a politician in this town, including the President, who has not given a speech on the importance of reducing the deficit. Well, ladies and gentlemen, talk is cheap. Now we are going to find out who is willing to do something about the deficit.

The first step in doing something about it is to recognize the facts. And one inescapable fact is that revenues have got to be part of any real deficit reduction package.

This conference report calls for new revenues: \$19.3 billion in fiscal year 1988 and \$64.3 over the next 3 fiscal years. I expect the Committee on Ways and Means to meet its reconciliation instruction, as it has every year since 1980. I also expect every Member who supports this resolution today to support the reconciliation bill that will follow.

The only person in Washington who thinks that the budget deficit can be addressed without new revenues is Ronald Reagan.

He is beginning to lock himself in concrete over the issue of new revenues. That will make our job all the more difficult.

It is possible, however, to craft a revenue bill that preserves the President's most important tax policy, lower rates, while recognizing the democratic principles of progressivity.

In crafting such a bill, I think that it is imperative that we avoid undoing the Tax Reform Act. If we go after that bill, particularly the rates, before the ink is even dry, we lose any chance of getting the President on board and getting a bill signed. In addition, we give Ronald Reagan one more excuse to ignore the deficit.

Ronald Reagan is a formidable opponent even when he is wrong. And he is wrong when he says we don't need new revenues more to attack the deficit. But he is right on the issue of raising the tax rates.

I think we can develop a revenue bill that meets the deficit reduction goals of this resolution and is consistent with the policy of the Tax Reform Act. By doing this, we will force the President to confront his deficits once and for all.

We have to force the President to accept the responsibilities of his office. I believe that the only way to do this is to adopt a responsible deficit reduction bill, including revenues, and to restore the automatic trigger for a sequester under Gramm-Rudman.

I am convinced that unless he is faced with an automatic sequester, one that will hit equally between defense and nondefense spending, he will never face the reality of the budget deficit and the need to raise revenues.

I'm as frustrated as anyone with the posture the President and his supporters have taken with regard to the deficit. This President is the biggest deficit spender in our history. In the 4 years of the Carter Presidency, the total Federal deficit was \$250 billion. It took Ronald Reagan only 2 years to increase the deficit by over \$300 billion. Our total Federal debt has more than doubled during his Presidency. It took us 200 years for our total Federal debt to reach \$1 trillion. It took Ronald Reagan just 5 years to double the debt to \$2 trillion.

The President's antitax rhetoric is no less astounding than his antideficit speeches. He has signed the three largest tax increases in our history. His budget recommendations since 1981 have called for over \$200 billion in tax increases.

Even with these facts, he has successfully portrayed himself as being against tax increases and deficit spending.

I'm tired of this game of smoke and mirrors.

I'm tired of his bashing the Congress on the deficit.

And I'm tired of his supporters in the Congress sitting on the sidelines.

We have given the President a free ride. It is time to stop. It is my hope that the leadership will move quickly to restore the automatic trigger so that it will be in place when the reconciliation bill reaches the President's desk.

I want a bipartisan reconciliation package and I hope that we might still develop such a bill. But even more importantly, I want this deficit reduced. If it takes an automatic sequester, so be it.

I expect the Congress to meet its responsibility in reducing the deficit. It is high time that the President met his.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the Budget Committees have finally completed their dubious work in setting spending limits for fiscal year 1988. Having spun their "Wheel of Misfortune" they have ended up cutting the international affairs function by \$1.3 billion below the fiscal year 1988 CBO baseline. Apparently, our friends on the other side of the aisle believe our country can have an active and healthy foreign policy without paying for it. In its assumptions, the conference report suggests that foreign aid programs—particularly security assistance—should absorb the major share of cuts.

First of all, we have authorizing committees and an appropriations committee to make recommendations concerning program funding levels. The Budget Committee is not charged with this responsibility. Nor should it be. The Budget Committee is charged with recommending broad function levels, not deciding which countries and programs should be spared cuts, and which should not.

Second, the budget resolution suggests cuts in foreign assistance, the result of which could be to sharply slash aid to base rights and facilities access countries so important to protecting United States national interests abroad. We cannot afford to be without overseas military facilities. They are an investment in international stability and are essential to preserving our Nation's position in the world.

In any budget environment, it is of great importance that we not forget the fundamental need to provide adequate support to base rights and facilities access countries. Whether in the Persian Gulf, elsewhere in the Middle East, or in other corners of the world, our interests need to be protected, and I urge my colleagues to keep this in mind. Security assistance is foreign aid with very real and essential benefits to the United States. We cannot afford to forget this.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this mockery of a budget resolution. This is a budget built on puffery, chicanery and smoke and mirrors and topped off with a touch of blackmail.

The budget cuts in this measure—as skimpy as they are—are fake and the bottom line is bogus.

We know—all of us know—that the economic assumptions on which this budget is based are outdated and overly optimistic. This budget says we will meet our goal of reducing the deficit to \$108 billion but we know that this is not the case. If we implement this budget we know the deficit will be upward of \$134 billion.

The only thing in this budget that is honest is the price tag and who is going to pay for it—the taxpayer. Over two-thirds of any real deficit reduction in this budget comes from new taxes—\$19 billion in 1987 and \$64.3 billion over the next 3 years.

This is not a serious budget and it is not a responsible budget.

To make matters worse, this budget contains a little touch that goes beyond anything I have ever heard of—a touch of blackmail.

In this budget, we tell the President of the United States, that if he swallows \$64.3 billion of tax increases that he has ardently opposed, we may give him \$7 billion more for national defense. This is outrageous irresponsibility.

If we need \$7 billion more for our national defense, it should be in this budget with no strings. If we don't need it, \$7 billion is a pretty stiff price to pay for a bribe.

This is not the way to budget for our national security. It is totally irresponsible.

I urge my colleagues to be honest. This is a bad budget and it should be defeated.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this budget. Everyone should.

It is clear this budget is a taxpayer's nightmare. It is designed to increase taxes by \$64.3 billion in the next 3 years, \$19.3 billion next year alone. That \$19.3 billion figure represents 52 percent of the \$36.85 billion in real deficit reduction it achieves next year. Comparing these taxes to the President's budget and its reliance on revenues is extremely misleading. Unlike the President's budget, which recommended selling Federal assets and a variety of user fees to get most of its new revenues, this budget is a tax budget, pure and simple.

Of course, this budget does not tell you what taxes we will consider. This budget makes it likely Ways and Means will consider increasing taxes on phone service, gasoline, cigarettes, beer, wine, and distilled spirits. We are probably not going to look at changing the new tax rates or many other parts of the tax reform bill. I doubt anyone in the House wants to give every special interest group that lost something last year a chance to come back in 1987 to refight battles that took the



entire 99th Congress to finish. Excise taxes are on the table and those of us who come from States affected by these kinds of taxes had best remember that a vote for this budget will propel Congress into a discussion of excise taxes. We cannot have this budget pass and then claim we did not really want those same taxes considered when reconciliation comes to the floor.

Its deceptive to claim the new taxes are to be magically set aside to reduce the deficit. Money is fungible. What you really have is the same old "tax and spend" formula the public rejected years ago.

Those who think this is an honest attempt to meet the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings \$108 billion target will be disappointed to find it does not. The material policy changes in this budget only produce \$36.85 billion in deficit reduction next year. The rest is made up by using the same economic assumptions Budget Committee Democrats have been ridiculing ever since January.

The most egregious abuse, however, lies in the conference report's provision of millions of dollars for public financing of Senate campaigns. In a year when the budget will raise taxes while cutting Medicare, farm program spending, and defense, this budget also provides that we will spend taxpayers' money to buy bumper stickers and campaign buttons for Senate candidates. That is hardly the kind of new budget priority we should be setting in light of the seriousness of the deficit.

I find the reliance on taxes and other aspects of this budget to be reason enough to oppose this conference report. We can produce a better budget. For taxpayers' sake, we ought to reject this proposal and send it back to the conference committee for more work.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference agreement. It is a responsible compromise that protects the House position on health programs for the elderly and the poor.

I would like to thank Chairman GRAY and the other House conferees for their defense of health programs.

The conference agreement moves us along the path of deficit reduction and at the same time recognizes a number of pressing health care needs.

It allows a total of \$970 million in budget authority for AIDS research and education, which will help our Nation address this pressing public health emergency.

It allows an additional \$100 million to help local governments and private nonprofit orga-

nizations deliver health care services to the homeless.

It allows an additional \$550 million for badly needed improvements in the Medicaid Program. This will enable us to make some long-overdue improvements in the quality of care in nursing homes, to protect spouses of nursing home patients from impoverishment, and to expand our infant mortality initiative to working poor pregnant women and their babies.

While the conference agreement requires some savings in the Medicare Program, it specifies that these savings are not to come at the expense of elderly or disabled beneficiaries.

While this conference agreement is a good one, it is not ideal. I have never been comfortable with the level of Medicare savings it expects. And I do not believe that the increase in funding for AIDS is adequate. In addition to research and education, which the conference agreement provides for, we will also need resources for voluntary testing, which it does not speak to. Finally, the Energy and Commerce Committee is directed to enact some unspecified savings that will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for us to achieve.

On balance, though, Chairman GRAY and his colleagues have brought us a sound health budget. I urge my colleagues to support the conference agreement.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this budget reduces the deficit by more than \$36 billion next year. At the same time, it provides for the legitimate needs of the citizens of this Nation by preserving the funding for emergency national priorities contained in the House-passed budget resolution. This ensures adequate funding for AIDS education and research, for the homeless, for education, for trade and welfare reform and for catastrophic health care insurance and other health programs.

This budget also provides for a strong national defense, but it declares that we will no longer pay for huge defense increases with a Federal credit card. The budget provides that an additional \$7 billion requested by the President for defense will be available only if the deficit reduction legislation called for by this budget is enacted.

Of course, this budget is not perfect. Anyone who wants to find an excuse to oppose it will have no trouble. But the question to ask anyone who urges a "no" vote is not why he opposes it, but where is his alternative and where has that alternative been for the last 6 months? If the answer is that he has no alternative, I can only assume that he is heeding the advice given during the debate on the budget resolution in April that you can avoid trouble by being against budgets. I just hope that there are not many Members in this body who are more concerned with avoiding trouble than with being re-

sponsible on an issue of this importance.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOULTER].

Mr. BOULTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our chairman of the Committee on the Budget stated that the conference agreement does reflect the priorities of the American people. I cannot believe that it would, Mr. Speaker. When was it determined and how was it determined that the American people have as their priorities no cuts in domestic spending programs, cuts in our defense, in our national security needs, and an increase in taxes? When was it determined that that represents the priorities of the American people? It represents the priorities, Mr. Speaker, of the Democratic Party in both bodies of this Congress. And the leadership of the Democratic Party also, who will control both bodies, have been very up front about that. They want to increase domestic spending and increase taxes and they want to increase the taxes under the guise of providing for national security and deficit reduction when even with the increased taxes of \$65 billion over a 3-year period we do not even get a defense budget that keeps pace with inflation.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have to point out that these taxes are unspecified. They will likely be in the form of regressive excise taxes which once again will hit the average working man and woman in America or perhaps they will eliminate the reduction of the tax rates that we accomplished in the historic tax reform legislation. But in any case, Mr. Speaker, this budget does not reflect the priorities of the American people. Deficits are not caused by Government taxing people too little, they are caused by Government spending too much and the priorities of the American people will insist upon limited government, reduced spending, spending reforms, a strong national defense, and low taxes.

□ 1545

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, to come before the Congress, and to say that the President causes deficits and not Congress is a little bit like the gentleman that Abraham Lincoln described who came into court accused of murdering his parents and pleaded mercy, because he was an orphan.

Deficits are caused by the Congress of the United States. We are the ones

who vote to enact or cut taxes. We are the ones who pass appropriations bills that spend dollars.

The President does not do those things, and we know that.

Deficits are caused by a profligate Congress. This budget debate is nothing more than a political debate. Whatever budget we adopt, we will waive tomorrow. We have waived it over 100 times last year. There is no reason to believe we will not waive it again that many times next year.

It is a political debate. The question is, Who do the American people want to govern them in 1988? We are starting out the Presidential election here; that is what this is all about.

Who do you want to govern you, America? Last year the Democrat Party said, give us control of the U.S. Senate, and we will show you what governing America will be like when you elect us President in 1988.

What does that party do? No. 1, you wait, and you wait, and you fuss and you fume, and you cannot agree on anything. Finally, you come around to your old ways. You settle back upon what you have always done, and that is tax and spend, and tax and spend, tax and spend, slash defense, and then trash the effort to balance the budget, the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings bill.

What does this other party stand for? Precisely what it stood for in 1980 and 1984: cut inflation, cut unemployment, cut interest rates, cut taxes, and let the American system work. Let free enterprise reign, and let the individual talents of Americans shine forth; and that is what this party is all about on this side of the aisle, so we are talking about a political debate. Choose up and take your sides.

It is pure and simple: tax and spend, and let on this side the American free enterprise reign, so let us get on with it.

The budget debate is nothing more than a debate. It means nothing, because the budget you adopt will be waived and waived and waived.

What we are really talking about is, are we going to let the American people have the freedom from Government that we celebrate the 200th anniversary of this year?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK].

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was sitting there 1 minute ago listening to this debate, and thinking what the American public must think.

As an American, I would have some real concerns about the future of my country.

Half are trying to blame the President. The other half are trying to blame the Democrats in the Congress. The fact of the matter is, there is

enough blame to go all the way around on both sides.

The President has not done what he should have done; the Congress in many instances has not done what it should have done.

I suggest to the Members today, though, we were elected to govern, and let us get on with the governing instead of sitting there blaming everybody. We are all great Americans. We will put that down, and let us go ahead with the business.

This budget is not perfect. Of course, it is not. I wish the minority had had more input into it quite frankly, because if the minority had, maybe some of the things that I wanted a little more would have gone that way.

There is a lot in there that I do not like. In fact, in most bills that I vote for, I can find plenty of reasons not to vote for. I was elected by my constituents to help government, and to govern this country.

Even though the bill may not be exactly what the Members want, go ahead and vote for it, and see if we cannot work it out in the appropriations bills, any of the things on down the line.

We were elected to govern, and let us govern. Go ahead and vote for it.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I, along with some of my Democrat colleagues, attended a breakfast given by the Democrat Study Committee, the CED, and some Republican groups; and we were again told in absolutely no uncertain terms that the trade deficit is a function of the domestic deficit, and that if America, if this Congress cannot do something to address the domestic deficit, that recession will follow as surely as night follows day and day follows night.

I know we are all deeply concerned. We talk about it among ourselves. We anguish about it, but we do not act. One of the things we are good at is blaming. We spend a lot of time at blame rhetoric. There is not any blame to be laid.

Our deficit has a perfect bipartisan origin. There was not one penny of spending that was not approved by the President of the United States, a Republican, the Senate of the United States under Republican leadership, and this House under Democrat leadership, so to pretend that this is anyone's budget other than ours, the Democrats and Republicans of America, is to put your head in the sand and prefer rhetoric to the kind of reality therapy that the jobs of the people that we represent depend on;

and mark my words, this is bread and butter for the people of America.

This is not deficit rhetoric. This is life. This is jobs. This is the economic well-being of our Nation and of the international community.

I am a Republican who has run for office every time consistently telling my constituents that to reduce the deficit, we have to increase taxes and cut spending; but I cannot vote for this budget resolution, because it does not pair those two tough courses of action responsibly, and it will not reduce the deficit.

Let us now look at your original promise, Democrats. The Democrats said, give us control, and the Democrats have it in the House and in the other body; and the Democrats have it in the conference, and I would remind the Members that it was the House Republican budget that came out of the conference last year, a budget that was responsible that the Democrats voted against, that the Republicans voted for; and it was the conference committee budget, so we have done our share.

This year the Democrats have complete control, and the Democrats said, let us make it simple, clean. Let us make it tough. We will increase taxes 50 percent, cut spending 50 percent.

Here are the taxes: more than \$19.5 billion out of \$36 billion is going to be tax increases. That is clean, and even some of us will support it. But let us look at the spending cut side. What happened to spending cuts that were to be balanced with tax increases?

Well, 20 percent of the spending cuts are asset sales. Those are not spending cuts; those are new revenues. Another 8 percent is increased collections through the IRS. That is not spending cuts; that is new revenues. And another portion of the spending cuts is the reduction in debt service costs due to saving \$36 billion, but if you do not save \$36 billion, you cannot get it in deficit retirement.

So we do not have that perfect symmetry that you offered the Nation in the rhetoric that you have been espousing in the last couple of months. We do not have \$18 billion in tax increases and \$18 billion in spending cuts. We have \$18 billion in tax increases, and we have a lot of new revenues. User fees are counted on the spending cut side of the budget. Asset sales you are putting on the spending cut side of the budget, and also increased revenues as a result of increased funding for IRS. What do you put on the cut side of the budget? You cut a mere \$7.2 billion including what you cut in defense. That is pathetic. And where do you cut? You do not tell us where you cut. You ascribe \$3.5 billion of all those cuts to reconciliation, and \$1.5 billion is to come out of Med-



icaid or Medicare, but nobody is to feel it.

The American people are not stupid. They know that if you are going to cut \$1.5 billion out of Medicare, they are going to know it. So let us get on with a program here. Let us reject this budget and let us come back in with something that says how you are going to cut that \$18 billion to pair with the \$18 billion in tax increases, and let us protect America's future.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we always stand and debate this bill in some sort of a vacuum, and I would like to supply a little bit of the data that ought to guide this Congress to place this resolution in context.

Since 1981, when defense and nondefense discretionary spending were about equal in the Federal budget, we have had the Reagan revolution. Surprisingly, I am sure, to many Americans, the fastest growing budget category in the last 6 years has been interest on the debt now budgeted to cost \$135 billion. There has been a 53-percent increase in that category since 1981.

The next fastest growing category of our Federal budget, of course, has been defense, with a 40-percent increase in outlays since 1981. Spending on entitlements—Social Security, Medicare, and other non-means-tested entitlements for retirees are about 69 percent of our overall entitlement spending—has gone up 21 percent, and spending on the other entitlements for the poor, those out of work, and for our farmers has gone up about 8 percent, and that despite the farm crisis driving up the cost of the farm bill.

In contrast, domestic discretionary programs, those things we think of as the Federal Government—support for the FBI, the Coast Guard, water development, et cetera—have been cut by 21 percent since 1981; but this budget resolution puts a stop to those kinds of spending priorities and sends us back in the direction of balance. It is a good attempt to start to reorient our priorities, putting first of all as our top priority—deficit reduction.

I think it is important to point out that when President Reagan submitted his budget to us back in January, he followed the old priorities. The President's 1988 budget did not require any defense reductions to control spending despite the burgeoning deficits. In fact he called for a 3-percent increase. The administration sought spending cuts of almost \$20 billion in domestic programs to pay for the defense buildup.

When you place aside the asset sales, those 1-year infusions of income and revenue that delude us into thinking that we have money to spend in the outyears. This budget resolution puts

deficit reduction first, because it finds \$29 billion for deficit reduction, in contrast to the President's effort to reduce the deficit by only \$11 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this is a balance of competing demands on the Federal Treasury. It is an appropriate fiscal approach. It is a vision of the future, not of the past. It represents where the American people are today, and I urge an "aye" vote by the Members for this resolution.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why one could get up here and rail against this budget, but when you get right down to the bottom line, the reason I oppose this budget is that it just is not going to work.

I hear Democrats talking about a \$36 billion reduction. That just is not going to happen. Why is it not going to happen? Well, let us take a look at the plan.

There is \$19.3 billion in new tax collections. The President is going to veto that. You know that, I know that. The revenues are not going to come in. Therefore, the deficit is going to be larger.

For those who are interested in this debate, let me put that \$19.3 billion in perspective. One would get the impression that the reason we have deficits in this country is that somehow we have starved the Federal Government as far as taxes and revenues are concerned. Do the Members know how much the revenues or the tax collections of the Federal Government are going to increase next year, in 1988, without any new taxes? Almost \$80 billion. Why is that going to occur? Because of new growth that has taken place in the economy.

So I do not think it is necessary that you raise \$19.3 billion in new taxes. We ought to cut spending.

There is \$7.2 billion in estimated revenues to the Federal Government because of the refinancing of rural electric loans. Now, on the surface that might sound good, that we ought to reduce interest rates on those loans, we ought to give a break to REA. But what happens is the net cost to the taxpayer over the life of those loans is \$15 billion, not a savings of \$7.2 billion. So we are being told this year we are reducing the size of the deficit \$7.2 billion because of the reduction in the interest rate on those loans, but the taxpayers are going to lose \$15 billion more over the life of these loans.

□ 1600

Others say, well, we are going to have another \$1.4 billion in new tax collections because we are going to put more IRS collectors out there. I think there are many people who would say

there are enough IRS collectors out there harassing the American public.

One more thing, \$1.2 billion in assumed interest savings because of the \$36 billion in deficit reductions. I make my point again, that \$36 billion in deficit reduction is not going to occur. Therefore, there will be no \$1.2 billion in interest savings.

Now, the previous speaker indicated that our Democratic friends are not telling us where they are making the cuts. Well, one of the areas that they have proposed, at least from what I have been able to determine, is a \$250 million reduction in Social Security, \$250 million. That is, \$100 million below what the President proposed, \$100 million below.

Now, in order for him to get to that number, the President had to talk about laying off 4,000 to 5,000 employees in the Social Security Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 additional seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. If they are going to go \$100 million below what the President proposed, how are they going to get it? On the Senate side they said they are going to do it by taking it out of the computer account. Well, there is not enough money in there to cover \$250 million. On the House side, they say they are going to take it out of the administrative account. Well, there is not enough money to do that unless you are willing to reduce the number of employees to 6,000, 7,000, 8,000, or 9,000.

The plan that they have put together is wrong. It is wrong for America. It is not going to happen, which I think maybe we can all kind of have a little sigh of relief; but the problem with that is that we all are going to end up with more red ink.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], a member of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Democrats can point at the President and implore the lack of leadership. Republicans can point at the Congress and say, "Wait a minute. You write the checks, not the President," and we can point out that the checks we write are for less spending than this President has requested.

Perhaps it would be informative if we all just stopped, looked the American people in the eye and say, "Look, folks, we are doing the best we can."

We have got to cut about \$36 billion from this deficit this coming year. We did the best we could last year. It looks like that budget is going to end

up having been cut more than \$36 billion.

Now we are hoping for the best here with this budget. We have a tough road. The President says that we cannot cut defense. If we do, he is going to veto the bill, so there is about 30 percent of the budget that comes off the table.

The President says, "Don't cut Social Security." Democrats agree with him.

We also want to add some entitlements to that that we cannot cut, and all told, that is 30 percent of the budget that comes off the table, so there is 70.

Of course, we have to pay interest on the debt. You know, the myth in America is that when the Congress needs money it prints it. Well, if we did that, we would not have a debt, would we?

We do not print it. We borrow it, and like everybody else, we pay interest on it and the interest on the debt this year is about 15 percent. We have to pay it. So there is 85 percent of the budget off the table before we start.

So the point is, we are doing the best we can.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, like my colleague, Congresswoman JOHNSON from Connecticut, I, too, attended the breakfast this morning where we enjoyed a presentation by the Committee for Economic Development, a very highly respected organization that has for some time published studies which have been very helpful to this body. As we discussed the question, of our dual deficits, the one point that came through loud and clear was we must begin with cutting the budget deficit.

When asked pointedly, their experts said that cutting spending is better than raising taxes. In light of that, I happen to agree with it, let us take a look at this conference agreement.

Frankly, in light of that need, this agreement stinks. In light of the proposition that a conference should work out the difference between a House-passed resolution and a Senate-passed resolution, this agreement stinks.

It would seem as though this conference paid no regard whatsoever to the resolutions from the two bodies, but worked out their own. It raises taxes. It cuts defense. It has higher domestic spending levels than either the House or the Senate approved and it engages in smoke and mirror savings.

This bill calls for \$64.3 billion in tax increases over 3 years, which is \$7.3 billion more than the House passed.

The bill contains higher domestic spending than was in either the House or the Senate bill. While domestic spending has increased faster than

either the House or the Senate, the defense takes \$70 billion in cuts in the next 3 years. That locks in 5 years of real decline in military spending.

Overall, this bill would increase outlays by 4.5 percent in fiscal year 1988, compared to 2.5 percent in fiscal year 1987.

My friend, the gentleman from Florida, CONNIE MACK, has already pointed out the REA pre-payments. Talk about smoke and mirrors, it looks like \$7.2 billion in cuts, but it costs \$15 billion over the next 28 years.

In a \$1 trillion plus budget, not one program is terminated. I dare say you cannot find an American citizen today that cannot look at the Federal Government and find something that they know should be terminated, yet this Congress cannot recommend one termination in a \$1 trillion budget.

Get this. The conference report also provides that the chairman of the Budget Committee has until July 1 to file the 302 allocations. Until the Budget Committee files its 302 allocations, the Appropriations Committee cannot divide its allocations among the subcommittees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Now, what that means, given that we have four or five Appropriations Committees scheduled before July 1, we are going to ask the Appropriations Committee to do its work before the Budget Committee gives them the 302 allocations within which that work must be done.

We are literally procedurally taken our cart and put it before our horse.

Now, that really cuts to the heart of the matter. The whole budget process is a shamble. We need a disciplined reformulation of the process with real checks and balances in the process, real limits defined in the process, some ability for the executive branch to check the excesses of this body because in fact we spend the money. We write the appropriation bills. We write the budget and then we challenge the President, despite his recommendations, which we ignore, to either veto our excesses or shut down the Government.

I say vote "no."

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], a member of the committee.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair and a responsible budget. It provides \$36 billion in real, permanent deficit reduction by spending cuts equally distributed on both the domestic and the defense sides of the budget, and it pro-

vides a comparable increase in revenues to be provided in the reconciliation bill that will be generated by this resolution.

This budget stands in contrast with 6 years of the Reagan administration's borrow and spend philosophy, which has only produced the biggest deficits in the history of the United States. With this budget, we slow that process down. We start the deficit on a permanent downward curve and we do it in a fair and a balanced way.

Budgets reflect our priorities and tell a great deal about the values we hold dear as a nation. This budget reflects our concerns for education, for training, for economic development, for the environment, for transportation, and for defense.

It is a budget that has been produced with a great deal of give-and-take effort among the Democratic members of the Budget Committee. It is a budget that may be our last choice and it is one that must be passed as we vote later today. The President has already failed in his budget proposal; we must succeed in ours.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, the battle over the budget has become the most depressing and frustrating challenge of our time. It divides parties. It divides branches of Government. It divides people from trust in Government and the ability to deal with a crisis.

If there is anything that we have consensus about on the floor of the House it is that we are dealing with a pervasive crisis and the fiscal ship of state is full of holes and leaking and sinking.

We also have a captain who has abandoned ship and who is of giving pep talks, talking about how great things are, that we do not have to cut defense, that we do not have to raise taxes, that all we need to do is to move the crew around, change some of the procedures, and the leaks will take care of themselves. It is a course set for economic disaster.

So what is the responsibility of the Congress? We have two choices, to follow this captain, to run, to hide, to pretend and to watch the ship sink, or to try to do something about it.

There are political risks with regard to each choice, but we know what the risk is if we do nothing, higher interest rates, higher inflation, high deficits and economic chaos. The risk if we pass a budget is whether we can hold to the guidelines that we have established in this budget resolution. History shows that regardless of what you consider the right priorities may or may not be, we have been able to squeeze the deficit down with this kind of framework.



So the question is one between whether we have some discipline, whether we like it or not, or no discipline whatsoever.

This President, this captain, has abandoned the fiscal ship. The question that faces us today is whether we will do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the resolution.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BUECHNER].

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to listen to the debate here. I am afraid that it is not really debate. It is really high comedy. It is written by Lewis Carroll, scripted by Woody Allen, filled with philosophic platitudes and, unfortunately, it has been directed by Milton Berle.

It would be truly laughable were it not for \$65 billion in new revenues to be imposed upon the American public in the next 3 years.

And what is the guise for that imposition? We have heard the rhetoric of borrow and spend and we have said tax and spend, but when you strip away all those words, you come up to the bottom line and the bottom line is that this Congress does not have the guts to terminate any programs. It feels that it is doing the American public a favor by always saying yes, and sometimes we say yes and yes, and sometimes we say, "You didn't ask us, but we are going to say yes," and we give and we give and we raise and we raise.

As the American public watches this comedy, through their tears or laughter should be tears of concern, and that is exactly what is it we are doing?

I have listened to people on the other side talk about the Republicans really should not be standing here talking, because they did not have their little box of a budget to bring forth. Let us look at the numbers. It is 2 to 1. Was there ever really a sincere belief there would be meaningful interchange of ideas to cutting the budget, because it was bound and determined that in an election year coming up that you would not cut any program.

□ 1615

As the appropriations bills come forward, we will see where all this talk about bipartisan participation in regulating the flow of money goes.

I would say to the American public, "Open up your eyes to this comedy, open up your ears, and get ready to open up your pocketbooks, because that is what the final line of the play will bring."

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas said that the Presi-

dent's budget was ignored. That is true—by his own party. The President sent the budget up here. It was not technically ignored, it was voted on. It got 27 votes. The Republican Members of this House by a 5-to-1 vote repudiated the President's budget.

So I would say to my friend from Missouri, "No, you are not always wrong, you on the other side, take heart and follow your earlier example."

They were right to reject the President's budget. Then we had other alternatives. The Democratic budget has some problems, but the problems are those that all of us on both sides have created, and the President, with the big deficit.

Trying to meet our obligations in the face of that deficit is very difficult. That is why the Republicans have not offered anything. What we know is not that they did not come forward with something that was going to win, but that they did not even try to put something together because they are so divided amongst themselves, and the task was too difficult.

So we have the President's budget and the Democratic budget. What the people on the other side do not want to talk about are the differences. The President's budget continues to cut Medicare deeply. He continues to propose policies that would say if you are old and if you are sick, you are going to have to pay more. That is why the Republicans voted against Ronald Reagan's budget.

He continues to propose that we make it harder for middle-class and working-class young people to finance a college education. The Republicans know that that is a mistake, and that is why they voted 5 to 1 to repudiate their President. They are talking nice about the President now that his budget is safely dead and buried. They were very careful not to do that when some of them might have had to vote for it.

The President would cut Medicare, he would cut education, he would inflate a defense budget that has already been inflated. That is why his budget was repudiated, and the budget that will be voted on now is the only live option.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] has one speaker remaining. We have two, so, therefore, with the concurrence of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, we will proceed to call on one speaker, then defer to the gentleman from Ohio, and then we will close.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LEATH].

Mr. LEATH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to govern this country in these times, even when everyone in-

volves makes an honest, concerted effort to do so.

It becomes even more difficult when the President, for 4 straight years, chooses not only to ignore the problem, but also to demagog it to the fullest.

Most of us had resolved ourselves to the fact that Ronald Reagan has no interest in a balanced Federal budget, so that comes as no surprise at all. But, when our Republican colleagues choose to wash their hands of any responsibility to govern that is indeed shocking, and disappointing, and hurtful.

Let me say to my very good Republican friends, you have made a grave mistake. You have let the President pull you down into the depths of irresponsibility. How do you explain, with any credibility whatsoever, that you don't even attend committee meetings, and then when you do, you refuse to vote—to participate—and then the absolute, ultimate refusal to even submit a plan on the floor of your own? As I recall, only a handful of you voted for the President's budget, so you surely can't say that's the reason.

Well, the plain truth is that you couldn't get there any more than we could without cutting defense and raising revenues, so you opted out of the process rather than admit the truth. Now you want to come before the people and lambaste and belittle those of us who chose to govern, no matter how difficult.

As a conservative, I have to tell you that this budget is repugnant to me. I do not like it. But you know what? It is just as repugnant to our liberal colleagues, for altogether different reasons, so everything is indeed relative.

But the record is clear that we have done the best we possibly could do when the President and his party go on vacation and refuse to participate in the process. When you consider that fact, this is a great budget.

But let me say to my conservative colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle—obviously, we will not get any Republican votes on this budget, and it would be easy for us to stand aside, as they are doing, and refuse to govern, but I sincerely hope that you won't yield to that political temptation. Instead, I hope you will stand up and govern, as difficult as that may be. That you will realize that this is far from a perfect budget from our perspective, but it is the very best we can do within the options available to us. That is, after all, what we must deal with doable options, and I can assure you that this budget is much better than no budget at all.

Many today, especially the President, want to throw up the smoke screen of changing the process to mask their inability to deal with the hard choices of writing a budget. Well,

I have no opposition to improving the process, but that, my friends, is not the problem. You can't create a process that will work void of the will to make it work.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we must make a very fundamental choice will we do the best we can and govern, or will we opt out of the process and merely criticize? I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this budget.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we need to support this budget resolution, because this budget resolution, with all of its problems, is much better than no budget resolution at all.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 1988 budget resolution passed the House on April 9, which as someone suggested, was 8 days too late. The resolution was drafted by the Democrats on the House Budget Committee and was passed without the vote of a single Republican Member of the House of Representatives. Why? Because the budget and deficit numbers were unrealistic, Federal spending was not controlled, and, once again, the Democrats would raise taxes. And now, just like a bad April Fools' joke, the conference report on the budget resolution has come back to haunt us.

The conference report calls for \$1.041 trillion in Federal spending and \$932.8 billion in revenues, leaving a deficit of \$108.2 billion. However, when the smoke clears and the mirrors are removed, those numbers do not stand up to scrutiny. Congress' own nonpartisan accounting department, the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] says that the deficit will be at least \$134 billion. According to another report, a confidential analysis by House Budget Committee economists put next year's deficit between \$144 and \$154 billion. And that is with a tax increase of \$19.3 billion next year that is a part of this conference report. A vote in favor of this resolution is a vote in favor of a \$64.3 billion tax increase over the next 3 years. Another \$7.9 billion is expected to be raised by increased IRS collections. That's a total of \$72.2 billion in increased taxes.

Is a tax increase necessary? I say no. CBO estimates that over the next 5 years, Federal revenues will increase an average of \$77 billion per year due to increases economic growth. That's \$231 billion over the next 3 years, and this resolution calls for another \$72.2 billion on top of that.

I do not support a tax increase. Instead, we must hold the line on Federal spending and this conference report falls far short in that department. Outlays are increased by 4.5 percent and not one Federal program is targeted for termination. One of the more interesting new programs is a scheme to finance the reelection of Senators to the tune of \$100 million. In short, this budget is just another in a long line of tax and tax, spend and spend budgets. Consequently, I cannot and will not vote for this budget resolution conference report.

During the course of this debate, there has been considerable criticism of the President and efforts to blame him for the deficit. However, those efforts are merely diversionary tactics designed to draw attention away from

the fact that it is Congress, not the President, that enacts the budget. It is Congress that writes and enacts the legislation which actually spends the money. The blame rests with Congress and with the budget process which imposes no fiscal responsibility on Congress.

There is one additional point that needs to be made. During the past several months, there has been a considerable amount of time, energy, and money spent on investigations and hearings in an effort to determine whether someone in the executive branch has violated a law. At the same time, Federal law says that legislative branch shall have completed action on the budget resolution by April 15. By my calendar, it's now June 23. It appears that when it comes to the law, in the Federal barnyard, some animals are more equal than others.

The conference report on the fiscal year 1988 budget should not be approved. With the passage of the Gramm-Rudman balanced budget law, we made a commitment to the American people that we were going to balance the Federal budget. This budget resolution repudiates that commitment and moves us back toward higher taxes, higher spending, and higher deficits. Is that the direction that our constituents want us to go? I think not. Therefore, I strongly oppose passing the conference report and urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 93, the fiscal year 1988 budget resolution. I believe that across-the-board spending cuts, rather than tax increases, are the best way to reduce the deficit. Congressional history indicates two very important points. First, that promised spending cuts in exchange for tax increases never materialize, and second, increased taxes encourage more, not less, Federal spending. For example, isn't it interesting that the proposed tax of \$21 billion for fiscal year 1988 equals the increase in domestic spending of \$21 billion. Under this budget resolution outlays would increase 4.5 percent in fiscal year 1988 compared to only 2.5 percent in fiscal 1987. This budget resolution calls for a \$64.3 billion tax increase over 3 years, which is \$7.3 billion more than the House-passed budget. This budget resolution calls for defense cuts over 3 years totalling \$70 billion. This following 2 consequent years of significant defense reductions.

Mr. Speaker, the American people would be interested to know that a recent nonpartisan watchdog of the Treasury study showed that of the 136 Representatives who were honored for showing fiscal responsibility, 126 were Republicans and only 10 were Democrats. I encourage my colleagues to begin showing fiscal responsibility and vote against this budget resolution.

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, the Commerce Department announced today that the United States owed the rest of the world \$263.6 billion at the end of 1986, more than double the 1985 total, greatly lengthening its lead as the world's largest debtor Nation. Foreign holdings of Treasury securities climbed \$12.3 billion in 1986 totalling \$96 billion.

This announcement gives even greater importance to the need to reduce the Federal budget deficit, one of the root causes of our

Nation's poor financial condition. Today, however, the Democrats have presented to the House a conference report on the budget which does absolutely nothing toward reducing the budget deficit.

The conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1988, House Concurrent Resolution 93, which we consider today, is a purely Democratic proposal which exposes that party's traditional and irresponsible tax and spend policies. This bill increases taxes by \$64.3 billion over 3 years and further increases the domestic spending contained in the already generous House-passed concurrent budget resolution. Even with a tax increase that will result in 1988 taxes being higher than those in 1980, the Democrats still must revert to smoke and mirrors in order to achieve the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit target of \$108 billion. This budget proves that Democrats cannot make the tough spending decisions needed to reduce the Federal deficit, even when the welfare of the whole U.S. economy is at stake.

In addition to sacrificing the economy, the Democratic budget also sacrifices the Nation's security. The budget contains language which would cut defense spending \$70 billion below current spending levels over 3 years. Such reductions would undeniably reduce our ability to defend ourselves and our allies.

In the final analysis, the Democrat's approach to this budget and to the budget process in general violates Congress' duty to responsibly provide for the defense and welfare of the Nation. I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference agreement on the budget resolution. The committee should be commended for its insight in addressing the pressing economic concerns of this country, while meeting the needs of the people.

I am aware that this has not been a very easy process for the members of the conference committee. The problems that we face in working to reduce the Federal deficit is compounded when debate does not include all factions of this Congress. I feel sorry for the Republican Representatives who chose not to participate in this very important budget process. I believe they have lost, and their constituents have lost.

Despite the massive opposition from the minority party, I feel that the package being considered before this body represents a unique balance between fiscal responsibility and humanitarian concern. Unlike the budget sent to this Congress by the President, the conference agreement provide expansions for selected emergency priority programs.

I am encouraged by the fact that the committee members recognized the significance of providing financial relief to the citizens of our country who have no homes. The proposal includes \$559 million in budget authority for the 1988 homeless programs. In cities like New York, where the homeless problem grows larger every day, these funds will provide much needed relief to these unfortunate families.

I am also pleased that the agreement includes the House budget resolution figures on education. So many of our young people are



denied access to higher education because of the inability to pay the high cost. Programs like the Pell grant are offer low-income students access to a world otherwise out of their reach.

The measure provides \$2.2 billion in budget authority over the level necessary to meet inflation in the education function. As we face the crisis of our trade deficit, high levels of unemployment because skill levels are inadequate, and increases in drug abuse and crime, I feel that similar increases in Federal support for education is the only way to combat these problems.

Also, in focusing on one of the most pressing health problems in the history of mankind, this budget resolution offers a total of \$970 in there authority for funding AIDS programs. I support this provision wholeheartedly. There is no greater threat to our society and the world than the devastation of this disease. We must begin to fight and fight aggressively in order to stop the spread of AIDS.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics, I also want to comment on funding in the budget resolution for drug programs.

Funding for drug abuse agencies and programs cuts across a number of budget functions including health—drug abuse treatment, prevention and research; education—drug abuse education; administration of justice—for example, Justice, DEA, State, and local drug law enforcement grants, Customs; transportation—Coast Guard; and, international affairs—international narcotics control. The conference agreement generally provides spending targets for these functions that are nearly identical to or higher than the House-passed version of the budget resolution. The major exception is in the area of international affairs which provides \$150 million less in budget authority and \$100 million less in outlays than the House bill.

In addition, the spending ceilings included in the conference agreement for health, education, and administration of justice are all well above the CBO current policy baseline which is the level needed to keep pace with inflation and continue current policy. The transportation function, although \$500 million below current policy, is still \$850 million above the House mark. International affairs spending is \$1.3 billion less than current policy for budget authority and \$650 million less for outlays.

Last year, in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, Congress made a major commitment to the American people to raise Federal drug abuse prevention and control efforts to a high budgetary priority. This bipartisan legislation added approximately \$1.7 billion to Federal antinarcotics efforts for 1987 and increased the total Federal drug budget to about \$4 billion. New resources were provided to address all aspects of the drug abuse problem—interdiction, enforcement, treatment, prevention, education, research, and international narcotics control.

Congress recognized that this legislation was a good start. But it was only a first step, and much more needs to be done. Unfortunately, the President's 1988 budget proposed to cut approximately \$950 million from Federal antidrug abuse efforts. The harshest cuts were for programs included in the omnibus drug bill to help hard-pressed State and local

governments fight drugs through increased drug law enforcement, expanded treatment efforts and support for drug abuse education. Customs personnel and air interdiction programs were also slashed, and funds for international narcotics control were cut.

The House budget resolution passed in April rejected the President's cuts and fully restored funding for Federal antidrug efforts. In my statement supporting the House budget resolution, I said that the spending targets provided ample flexibility to continue the antidrug initiatives begun last year and that we owed it to our constituents not to renege on the promises we had made.

The same can be said of the budget compromise we are considering today. This resolution is more than adequate to permit continued full funding of our antidrug program, provided we give these efforts the high priority they deserve in our consideration of appropriations measures.

I am particularly pleased with the increases provided for the administration of justice function. The conference agreement is \$400 million above the House target and \$250 million over current services. The conferees note that this level of funding will allow all discretionary programs to be funded in 1988 at least at their 1987 levels with additional increases for key priorities such as drug enforcement. As the primary sponsor of the State and local narcotics control assistance program incorporated in last year's omnibus drug bill, I am especially pleased that the budget agreement assumes this program will be fully protected.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to urge all of my colleagues to give their full support to this proposal.

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 93, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1988. I urge my colleagues to reject this proposal and return it to committee so that an honest bipartisan spending blueprint for the Government's coming fiscal year can be developed and passed.

I do not know of anyone who truly believes that this budget will come close to meeting the statutory deficit target for fiscal year 1988. It seems as though each year we go through what amounts to a political charade of the highest order: Where budget writers convene, pat themselves on the back for their work—no matter how inadequate—to reduce the deficit, and secretly hope that things will be better next year.

Well, we are running out of next years. The economic expansion we are currently enjoying is already very old by historical standards, and our window of opportunity to act is rapidly closing. With each passing year, the number of available options to right the wrongs of past budget transgressions grows smaller—and much more expensive.

Let's for a moment take a look at what this resolution does and why it is not a true plan for sound fiscal policy for our Nation. The budget resolution is a badly flawed political document, a charade of the worst possible kind.

It raises \$19.3 billion in unspecified taxes next year—and \$64.3 billion over the next 3 years—without coming anywhere near the appropriate degree of spending discipline which

should have been demanded. I am sorry to say that the budget resolution we are considering here today is nothing more than the same old tax and spend wolf in sheep's clothing.

Mr. Speaker, this sorry situation is a perfect example of the need for comprehensive reform in the budget process. The time has come for us to come clean with the American people and stop this annual charade.

We need to put an end to the use of gimmickry, escape hatches, and devices which allow the Congress to dodge, its fiscal responsibilities. The country will in fact go broke unless we act expeditiously to solve the deficit problem. A good first step would be to defeat this phony budget resolution, and get down to the business of writing a responsible budget with real deficit reduction.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to all this debate, especially the very interesting statements that have been made about the President trying to pass the buck. Well, the buck stops here. I have served under quite a few Presidents since I have been here, and there is not one of them who ever administered a program that was not first passed by this Congress. Every day, every second that I have been here this House has been controlled by the Democrats. So do not pass the buck downtown. Let us face up to the fact that in this budget, the Democrats are not asking to terminate any of those programs that have been causing the trouble. The only thing that they want to do is cut defense, and I often wonder whether or not that defense umbrella does not also cover our Democratic friends.

Oh, I know, the politics are not there, but the protection is.

I keep hearing this argument, "We've done the best we can." Well, if this is the best product that you can come up with, what would be the worst product that you could possibly come up with?

Name the programs that are being terminated. There are not any.

Let me say something about taxes. Right along, State and local governments have not been covered by Medicare in several States including Ohio. They say, "We don't have the money to pick up that extra cost of Medicare for our State and local employees." They may have to get it if this resolution passes. All the polls indicate that the people want reductions in expenditures, not tax increases. But as anticipated right from the start, the Democrats are coming up with more taxes on the American people. More taxes, that is what we are going to get and

that is what Mondale promised the American people. There are more taxes—\$19.3 billion in new taxes under this resolution. But this is only part of the process. Democrats might propose more taxes in this budget, but they first have to get it through the Congress. Then, second, they have to get the President to sign it, and he is not going to sign that one. He has said so many, many times.

Talking about types of taxes, you are going to hit the little guy if you even pick up some of these small taxes. We are talking about the cigarette taxes, taxes on alcoholic spirits. You talk about the gasoline tax. You know, to come up with any \$10 billion in revenues you have to put 12 cents a gallon on gasoline. You have to renege, as the Speaker of the House has indicated many times that he wishes that we would do, on the tax reductions that take place next year, or reduce those reductions. There are a lot of places that you have to go to come up with \$19.3 billion in new taxes. We should start with reductions in expenditures as required and requested by the American people.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], the distinguished majority leader of the House and the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I find the debate at its close another sad reminder of how our distinguished Republican colleagues, who for so many years have talked about the problems of the deficit and the need to reduce it, have chosen to take themselves off of the playing field, out of the game and to heckle from the stands those who are trying sincerely to deal responsibly with this issue.

With the exception of the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER], they have been unwilling to offer a budget resolution or alternative of their own. As much as I disagreed with his budget, at least the gentleman from California offered one, and I paid tribute to him at the time for that. The response of 124 of his Republican colleagues, however, was to vote "no" on the Dannemeyer budget.

When it came to the President's budget, and despite all their words of praise for his efforts to cut spending, 148 Republicans, four-fifths of their entire membership in the House, voted "no." It is a "no" vote, it is a "no" vote, it is a "no" vote—instead of being part of an affirmative effort to solve the critical fiscal problems that this country faces their answer was "no" to everything.

□ 1625

I have no way of knowing at this time whether the President will sign a

reconciliation or tax bill. Yet I truly believe that unless he is willing to come together with us, joined by our colleagues on the Republican side, we will have little chance of victory in what should be our common effort against this deficit.

In the meantime the Democrats out of necessity must assume the responsibility for governing. We have a budget that has been produced solely on our side, our colleagues across the aisle having abdicated any responsibility for it. We now have a duty to stand together and pass this budget.

Perhaps on another day, in another time, with a more cooperative President and a more willing Republican side of the aisle we could pass a better budget. For this hour and this day, and under these circumstances, however, this is the best budget we can pass. A vote for it is a vote for responsibility for commitment to reducing the deficit for proceeding with economic growth for the future of this country; for providing adequate services for our people, and for a strong national defense.

I call on all my Democratic Members to join in this effort.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 201, not voting 17, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 204]

#### YEAS—215

Ackerman	Bustamante	Dwyer
Akaka	Byron	Dyscn
Alexander	Cardin	Early
Anderson	Carper	Eckart
Andrews	Chapman	Edwards (CA)
Annunzio	Chappell	Espy
Anthony	Clarke	Evans
Aspin	Clay	Fascell
Atkins	Coelho	Fazio
Bates	Coleman (TX)	Feighan
Beilenson	Collins	Flake
Bennett	Conte	Florio
Berman	Conyers	Foley
Bevill	Cooper	Ford (MI)
Biaggi	Coyne	Frank
Bilbray	Crockett	Frost
Boggs	Darden	Garcia
Boland	de la Garza	Gaydos
Bonker	Derrick	Gejdenson
Borski	Dicks	Gibbons
Bosco	Dingell	Glickman
Boucher	Dixon	Gonzalez
Brennan	Donnelly	Gordon
Brooks	Dorgan (ND)	Grant
Brown (CA)	Dowdy	Gray (IL)
Bruce	Downey	Gray (PA)
Bryant	Durbin	Guarini

Hall (OH)	McCurdy	Savage
Hatcher	McHugh	Sawyer
Hawkins	McMillen (MD)	Scheuer
Hayes (IL)	Mfume	Schroeder
Hefner	Mica	Schumer
Hochbrueckner	Mineta	Sikorski
Horton	Mollohan	Sisisky
Howard	Montgomery	Skaggs
Hoyer	Moody	Skelton
Hubbard	Morella	Slattery
Huckaby	Morrison (CT)	Slaughter (NY)
Hughes	Mrazek	Smith (FL)
Hutto	Murphy	Smith (IA)
Jenkins	Murtha	Solarz
Jones (NC)	Nagle	Spratt
Jones (TN)	Natcher	St Germain
Jontz	Neal	Staggers
Kaptur	Nelson	Stenholm
Kennedy	Nichols	Stokes
Kennelly	Nowak	Stratton
Kildee	Onkar	Studds
Kleczka	Oberstar	Swift
Kolter	Obey	Synar
Kostmayer	Olin	Tallon
LaFalce	Ortiz	Thomas (GA)
Lancaster	Owens (NY)	Torres
Lantos	Panetta	Torricelli
Leath (TX)	Pease	Towns
Lehman (CA)	Penny	Traficant
Lehman (FL)	Pepper	Traxler
Leland	Perkins	Udall
Levin (MI)	Pickett	Valentine
Levine (CA)	Pickle	Vento
Lewis (GA)	Price (IL)	Visclosky
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Volkmer
Lloyd	Rangel	Walgren
Lowry (WA)	Richardson	Waxman
Lukens, Thomas	Rodino	Weiss
MacKay	Roe	Wheat
Manton	Rose	Whitten
Markley	Rostenkowski	Williams
Martinez	Rowland (GA)	Wise
Matsui	Roybal	Wolpe
Mavroules	Russo	Yatron
Mazzoli	Sabo	

#### NAYS—201

Applegate	Duncan	Konnyu
Archer	Edwards (OK)	Kyl
Armey	Emerson	Lagomarsino
AuCoin	English	Latta
Baker	Erdreich	Leach (IA)
Ballenger	Fawell	Lent
Barnard	Fields	Lewis (CA)
Bartlett	Fish	Lewis (FL)
Barton	Flipppo	Lightfoot
Bateman	Frenzel	Livingston
Bentley	Galleghy	Lott
Bereuter	Gallo	Lowery (CA)
Billakis	Gekas	Lujan
Bliley	Gilman	Lungren
Boehlert	Gingrich	Mack
Boulter	Goodling	Madigan
Boxer	Gradison	Marlenee
Broomfield	Grandy	Martin (IL)
Brown (CO)	Green	Martin (NY)
Buechner	Gregg	McCandless
Bunning	Gunderson	McCloskey
Burton	Hall (TX)	McCollum
Callahan	Hamilton	McDade
Campbell	Hammerschmidt	McEwen
Carr	Hansen	McGrath
Chandler	Harris	McMillan (NC)
Cheney	Hastert	Meyers
Clinger	Hayes (LA)	Michel
Coats	Hefley	Miller (CA)
Coble	Henry	Miller (OH)
Coleman (MO)	Hergert	Miller (WA)
Combest	Hertel	Molinar
Coughlin	Hiler	Moorhead
Courter	Holloway	Morrison (WA)
Craig	Hopkins	Myers
Crane	Houghton	Nielson
Dannemeyer	Hunter	Owens (UT)
Daub	Hyde	Oxley
Davis (IL)	Inhofe	Parris
Davis (MI)	Ireland	Pashayan
DeFazio	Jacobs	Patterson
DeLay	Jeffords	Pelosi
Dellums	Johnson (CT)	Petri
DeWine	Johnson (SD)	Porter
Dickinson	Kanjorski	Pursell
DioGuardi	Kasich	Quillen
Dornan (CA)	Kastenmeier	Rahall
Dreier	Kolbe	Ravenel



Regula	Shumway	Sundquist
Rhodes	Shuster	Sweeney
Ridge	Skeen	Swindall
Rinaldo	Slaughter (VA)	Tauke
Ritter	Smith (NE)	Taylor
Roberts	Smith (NJ)	Thomas (CA)
Robinson	Smith (TX)	Upton
Roemer	Smith, Denny	Vander Jagt
Rogers	(OR)	Vucanovich
Roth	Smith, Robert	Walker
Roukema	(NH)	Watkins
Rowland (CT)	Smith, Robert	Weber
Saiki	(OR)	Weldon
Saxton	Snowe	Whittaker
Schaefer	Solomon	Wolf
Schneider	Spence	Wortley
Schuetz	Stallings	Wyden
Sensenbrenner	Stangeland	Wyllie
Sharp	Stark	Yates
Shaw	Stump	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—17

Badham	Ford (TN)	Ray
Boner (TN)	Gephardt	Schulze
Bonior (MI)	Kemp	Tauzin
Daniel	Lukens, Donald	Wilson
Dymally	Moakley	Young (AK)
Foglietta	Packard	

□ 1640

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Young of Alaska against.

Messrs. HERTEL, LIVINGSTON, and KONNYU changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GRAY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment to the title.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

The motion was agreed to.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I was on the floor during the entire vote but neglected to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the RECORD reflect that I intended to vote for the budget resolution.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was detained on the rollcall on the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 93. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 204.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on the conference report on the concurrent resolution (H. Con.

Res. 93) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, may I add a hearty vote of thanks to the staff of the Committee on the Budget on both sides of the aisle.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2700, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION, 1988

Mr. HALL of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 100-178) on the resolution (H. Res. 207) waiving certain points of order against consideration of the bill (H.R. 2700) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1988 AND 1989

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 190 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1777.

□ 1652

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1777) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1988 and 1989 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, and for other purposes, with Mr. SWIFT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 18, 1987, pending was the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Under the unanimous consent agreement of June 18, 1987, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICAL] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me first of all say what this amendment does. What this amendment does is it places a restriction on all passports. It does not single out any one. It places a restriction on all United States passports saying they cannot be used to provide direct help to the Communists in Central America.

The amendment is wholly informational in nature. There are absolutely no penalties whatsoever connected with this amendment. All it does is make certain that Americans know that their passports are not to be used in manner that allows them to provide direct assistance to Communist activities in the regional world vital to us.

To show you how innocuous the amendment is from the standpoint of enforcement, the State Department indicated in their opposition to the amendment that the main opposition comes from the standpoint that it would be almost impossible to enforce because there is no enforcement mechanism in it plus the fact that they already have the power to do this. So what we would really be doing is making a policy statement that the State Department ought to use the power that they already have in order to restrict people from going to Central America to help the Communists.

The reason why I think it is important to do that kind of thing is, I have learned, for instance, since I introduced this amendment that there are church groups who I think are trying to do something very humanitarian in nature.

□ 1655

These church groups are trying to do the right things, but they have ended up putting themselves in a position where they are providing the food into the concentration camps in Nicaragua.

Is it too harsh to be calling what some people refer to as displaced persons concentration camps? Is it not too harsh to refer to what is going on in Nicaragua as concentration camps, because people are being herded at gunpoint into these displaced persons camps and being held at gunpoint?

They are in fact concentration camps. I do not think we ought to, in the name of humanitarian aid, suggest that that is what Americans should be participating in. Humanitarian help ought to be people-to-people kind of help, not the functional equivalent of aiding the Communists to abuse human rights.

My amendment encourages people-to-people kinds of efforts, because it is specifically aimed at only keeping people from aiding Communist activities.

What the amendment does not do is some of the things that have been said in opposition to it; for example, there

is no ban on travel whatsoever in this amendment.

If one travels there to Central America for humanitarian, informational, or vacation travel, that is fully permitted.

If one wants to go to lovely downtown Managua and stay at the hotel without water, one is free to do so under my amendment.

It does not impinge on any citizen's constitutional right to go to Central America to see, hear, speak, or do whatever he or she so wishes, so long as the purpose of the travel is not to help Communist governments or Communist guerrillas in the region.

I thought that would be relatively noncontroversial, and I must admit that I have been rather interested to see some of the silly things that have been said in opposition.

Margaret Thatcher in the last campaign referred to the "looney left." The "looney left" has been very much in evidence in speaking to my amendment, because we have had some extreme kinds of things said about it.

Mr. Chairman, in recent months there has been almost an orgy of criticism directed against those who in this country want to assist freedom fighters, and the embryonic democracies in Central America.

This amendment says to the political left, you ought to examine your own activities and assure yourselves that you are not directly helping Communist forces in this area.

Since the end of Vietnam war, we have learned how much damage the Jane Fondas of the world did when they went to Vietnam, how they harmed our people there.

The last thing we need to be doing is producing a new generation of Jane Fondas in Central America.

We may disagree in this House on the issue of the Contras, but I hope there is no disagreement in this body with the nature of communism in this hemisphere, or the need of our citizens to know that assistance to those Communists is wrong.

I have heard Members say time and time again on this floor that we know the Sandinistas are bad, and we ought not to go doing anything to support the Sandinistas. That is what this amendment does.

We ought not to be doing anything to assist the Sandinistas. We ought not to be doing anything to assist the Communist guerrillas.

The Members may not want to do anything to help the people who are fighting against them either, but we ought not to be on the side of the people who are human rights abusers.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW HAMPSHIRE TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire to the amendment offered by Mr. WALKER:

In line 16 of the amendment, strike the word "for" and insert "to the military operations of", and

In line 20 of the amendment strike the word "for" and insert "to the military operations of".

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the amendment that the gentleman is offering, and I will go through it so every Member has an understanding, as I have presented my amendment, I made it quite clear that what I am attempting to do is make certain that people do not go down and engage in the kinds of things that permit the Communists to try to win a victory in Central America.

As I understand, the language that the gentleman is offering, the gentleman's amendment would say that no American can go down there and help in the military operations of the Government of Nicaragua, or the military operations of the Communist guerrilla movement, is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is correct. This will clarify, and I am sure there are some concerns on the other side on this issue, and this is very specific language.

I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has indicated that what the gentleman's amendment is, what the gentleman's intent is, and this clarifying language will spell it out very clearly.

We are talking about military operations, no help from American citizens traveling over for the purpose of military operations in support of the Sandinistas, the Communists in Nicaragua.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, in other words, we would not have any chance at all of impinging on true humanitarian aid going into that area, under the gentleman's amendment.

The gentleman's amendment ensures Americans are not going down there for the purpose of helping the Sandinista government or the Communist guerrilla movements operating in that region.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does the gentleman accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept that amendment, and would ask unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. WEISS. In the presentation that the gentleman from Pennsylvania made earlier, the gentleman argued against providing humanitarian assistance to governments, and distinguished that from humanitarian assistance to people.

Do I understand that now there is no distinction, that all humanitarian assistance to the Government of Nicaragua is OK?

Mr. WALKER. I think the distinction here is this; for example, it is humanitarian assistance going into a concentration camp being run by the military, that would still be covered under the gentleman's amendment, because that is a military operation; but if in fact what we are talking about is true humanitarian assistance being channelled through Government agencies down there, at that point there would be no problem under the language offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WEISS. So the gentleman's position has been changed?

Mr. WALKER. No. Let me state what I think the gentleman has done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, I think what the gentleman from New Hampshire has done is given us an additional clarification of what the original intent of my amendment would be. It has substantially narrowed it. I would agree with that, but I think it goes to the intent, and I hope the House will approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, let me point out that I only have 20 minutes of time. If the gentleman would get some time from his side, I would be happy to answer questions. I have plenty of Members waiting for time on this side.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] be incorporated in the original amendment that I offered.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized on his reservation of objection.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WALKER. I made a unanimous-consent request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Would the gentleman repeat his request, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will repeat his request.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, my request was that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] be incorporated in the amendment that I originally offered.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]?

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman answer a question for me so I may understand the nature of the amendment?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would point out that it is the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], but the Chair would further point out that the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] has reserved the right to object, and he is now speaking on his reservation.

Mr. BERMAN. And may I ask the Chair what time the gentleman from California has on his reservation?

The CHAIRMAN. Subject to the will of the Committee, the gentleman has reserved his right to object and is being recognized on that reservation.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the Chair.

My question is with respect to this amendment, and I would ask, is the gentleman indicating that an American citizen who goes to Central America or who goes to Nicaragua and works on an irrigation project that produces food which is used to feed the military, or works in a hydroelectric plant that provides energy for civilian and military purposes is the kind of individual who engages in the kind of conduct that is proscribed by this amendment? Is the gentleman indicating that it only applies to people who are actually fighting in the Nicaraguan military? Is the gentleman indicating that he is aware of any American citizens who come within the present meaning of the amendment he seeks to make to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a response?

Mr. BERMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire for an answer.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Well, first of all, we are not talking about coffee pickers or banana pickers here. We are talking about people who are going to Nicaragua and who are hard-core people who support the Communist regime of the Nicaraguans. Now, I can give the gentleman examples if he would like examples of the type of people I am talking about, if he wants to yield further on his time.

Mr. BERMAN. But if the gentleman would consider answering under my reservation an additional question, I would ask, are you speaking here about the motives of these people?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state to the gentleman from California that he is speaking on a reservation of objection. The Chair asked, is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to modify his amendment, and the gentleman has been using the time for debate. The time should be used to examine the gentleman's reservation.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would point out that there is already a unanimous-consent request before the committee, and the Chair is trying to determine whether there is an objection.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized to state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is some confusion here.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], if I understand this correctly, has an amendment before the Committee. There is an amendment to the amendment that has been offered. There is a unanimous-consent request pending at this time to amend the Walker amendment. And is there now a reservation pending? Was there, or is there a reservation pending?

The CHAIRMAN. There was a reservation by the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] to the unanimous-consent request to modify the Walker amendment with the text of the Smith of New Hampshire amendment. What the Chair is indicating is this: whether the gentleman wishes to withdraw the reservation.

The Chair asks, is there objection? The Chair understands that the reservation is withdrawn.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]?

Hearing none, the amendment is so modified.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will announce the time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has 12 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] has 20 minutes remaining. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I think that the question that was just asked by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], to the maker of the amendment to the amendment helps to point out some of the problems with this amendment.

The gentleman from California asked the maker of the perfecting amendment whether or not this particular amendment would impact, for example, an irrigation worker who is working in Nicaragua if the corollary effect of the irrigation worker's activities might indirectly provide some assistance to the Nicaraguan military. If I understand the answer of the gentleman from New Hampshire, the gentleman from New Hampshire responded essentially by not answering the question. He essentially responded by saying, "Look, we are trying to get at people who are sympathetic with the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua."

That is exactly the point I think we are dealing with on the House floor. We should not be talking about going after somebody, I would hope, based upon his political sympathies. We should analyze the specific conduct that would trigger the operation of this legislation. If we are talking about specific conduct that would trigger the operation of this legislation, then in fact we are talking precisely about the type of activity that the gentleman from California asked about.

□ 1710

If an American citizen decides to go down to Central America to provide humanitarian assistance to the people of Central America, regardless of the American citizens' sympathies, loyalties, political considerations or intentions, and the actions of that American citizen somehow indirectly provided assistance, as inferred by the Reagan administration, who would be asked to enforce this particular amendment to the Sandinista regime, that would trigger the operation of this overbroad amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVINE of California. I will be happy to yield after I finish making my point, because I think that we

have here an ambiguous and overbroad amendment. I would like to make my point and then I would be happy to respond to the gentleman.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we are dealing here with an amendment that effectively is designed to prevent American citizens from traveling to Central America if it turns out that these American citizens involve themselves in any activity which even remotely or indirectly provides assistance to the Sandinista government of Nicaragua or to any other group in the region which the President of the United States decides to designate as a Communist group.

Now, first of all, let us be clear on some very specific realities. No. 1, it is my understanding, and I hope that the gentleman on the other side of the aisle will correct me if I am wrong, it is my understanding that this administration has not sought this specific amendment. It is my understanding that this specific amendment goes beyond what even this particular administration has been seeking. This is an amendment which would prevent American citizens from traveling to Central America under a wide variety of possible circumstances.

The gentleman's amendment declares that such assistance provided by American citizens "causes serious damage to the national security and foreign policy of the United States." The gentleman apparently thinks that American citizens supporting the Sandinistas threaten American security interests, and reasons from that premise that we should prevent them from going to Nicaragua.

Frankly, I fail to see the danger posed to our national security by Americans traveling to Nicaragua and teaching the people of that country how to read and write, or teaching them how to farm so that they can feed themselves, or providing medical care to the victims of the war between the Nicaraguan Government and the United States-sponsored Contras.

Much of the population of Central America already believes that America is only interested in military solutions to the region's problems. If we continue to project the image of an America bereft of compassion, bereft of providing assistance to those in need, regardless of political ideology, then we risk completely alienating the very people who I think the gentleman agrees we are trying to help. If the answer to the gentleman's concerns about our national security is the promotion of democracy in Central America, then I would suggest to him that we could do that a lot better by providing Central Americans with badly needed humanitarian assistance than by putting a gun to their heads.

I oppose this amendment because it is inconsistent with the freedoms which I know that the gentleman

sponsoring the amendment cherishes as much as I do—the right to freely express one's political views, and to freely travel to other nations.

Why should we ban travel to Nicaragua? We are not at war with that country.

If my colleague was really serious about protecting the lives of Americans abroad, he would ban all travel to Nicaragua, including travel to aid the Contras. But, of course, the amendment before us does not do that.

This amendment places a strictly political criterion on citizens' travel to Central America—do they or do they not support the Reagan administration's views on who the United States should be supporting in the region. If they feel bound by conscience to provide humanitarian assistance to people who the President views negatively, then they are stripped of their constitutional right to freedom of movement.

Thus, this amendment not only usurps the President's authority under the passport act to curtail travel to countries if conditions there threaten the safety of U.S. citizens; it also tears up the Constitution for citizens who disagree with the President's foreign policy.

Under U.S. law, citizens may leave this country to do whatever they wish in a foreign country free from any U.S. legal restrictions other than those designed to preserve their safety and the Nation's neutrality. Even the chief restriction on private citizens' interactions with foreign nations, the Neutrality Act, does not, and indeed cannot, reach simple travel abroad. It only covers military actions instigated and/or launched from the United States by private citizens against foreign nations with whom the United States is at peace.

I am no fan of the Sandinistas. I have spoken out repeatedly in opposition to their policies. Their repression of a free press, their refusal to hold truly democratic elections, and their continued violation of human rights deserve condemnation. However, the nature of the Sandinista Government is not at issue here. American citizens' right to freedom of movement is.

Individuals who wish to travel to Central America and provide assistance to governments or organizations must be guided by their conscience alone in making this choice.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this pernicious amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVINE of California. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania on that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 30 seconds.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to get that time from the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Mica].

Mr. LEVINE of California. Could I ask the gentleman from Florida, could I have an additional 30 seconds?

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, let me state that we have the full 20 minutes scheduled. I do not mind yielding 30 seconds, but the next speaker will have to be cut by 30 seconds.

Mr. LEVINE of California. All right, go ahead.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. WALKER. We will not have a chance to reply?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. I have a letter from the Department of State that speaks to that point.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Last week President Reagan went to West Berlin and he asked Gorbachev to tear down the wall. By this amendment, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is building a wall, a wall not directed at the Sandinista government in Nicaragua or Cuban or Soviet-controlled guerrilla groups in Central America, but a wall aimed at keeping American citizens with constitutional rights within a certain parameter that he thinks meets his ideological notions of what is appropriate and what is not appropriate.

I suggest that this is an amendment not directed against them, it is an amendment directed against us, the American people.

The fact is that under existing law the President of the United States with a stroke of his pen could—and I would be very much against him doing it—could eliminate travel to Nicaragua through the imposition of currency restrictions, if he chose to.

The President wisely recognized there was something different between economic relationships dealing through trade in his economic embargo and the effort to strike directly at the heart of American citizens in their right to travel.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire gets to the heart of the motivation. He said so himself. His amendment has certain words, but he wants to find out what is in the heart, what is the role of that person who might be traveling down through Central America or to Nicaragua.

Many years ago we decided travel should not be premised on ideology. The Passport Act, the International Economic and Emergency Powers Act,



all give the President unilateral authority to protect American citizens in places and in countries and to prevent travel where we cannot protect Americans. We have abandoned a long time ago, and I thought forever, the notion that travel would now be superimposed with an ideological test of the kind we have here.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the rejection of this amendment, as amended, and that we go on with the passage of the bill.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Pennsylvania allow me to yield to him for a question?

Mr. WALKER. Yes. I would be glad to.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the gentleman object to an amendment if we expanded this now, since we do not want the people of the United States involved in the military operations in Nicaragua, let us expand this to all military operations in Nicaragua, whether it involves the Government of Nicaragua, the guerrilla groups which have been designated by the President as Communist, or even those designated as freedom fighters? Maybe we ought to stay out of this fight completely.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I would say to the gentleman that I do believe that we ought to have the freedom fighters down there. I do not believe there are Americans who are fighting alongside them, but I would not agree to that kind of an amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Can the gentleman explain why?

Mr. WALKER. I think that the Communist threat in Central America is real, that the human rights violations of the Sandinista government are now documented. They have been all over the front page of the New York Times. We have got some very, very, serious problems down there.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, at this point I reclaim my time.

Mr. WALKER. Well, the gentleman asked some very serious questions.

Mr. DURBIN. I did not ask for a speech. I asked for an answer.

The difficulty we have here, aside from the outburst of the gentleman from Indiana, which has come to be expected, is the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is suggesting that the United States should not be involved in military activity if it is a portion of the Government or the Government of Nicaragua that he does not care for, and yet he turns a blind eye to the fact that those who the President designates as freedom fighters and some call Contras have in fact at various times been involved in the drug trade, have instituted acts of terrorism against the civilian population of Nicaragua, so I take it—

Mr. WALKER. Which side is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. DURBIN. Well, I have not yielded to the gentleman, so I take it that the gentleman is perfectly at ease with the idea that Americans could continue to run any type of military equipment, ammunition, bombs, whatever it might be, down to the Contras, setting off mines in roads to blow off the likes of children and civilians, and consider that a perfectly normal activity, but the gentleman is somehow adverse to the idea that perhaps we might be assisting.

I think we ought to have symmetry in this situation. I am preparing an amendment here which says that we are not going to allow Americans to travel down there as soldiers of fortune on either side. Let us let that country and those people there resolve their difficulties.

I would think the gentleman has one serious problem here. The serious problem the gentleman has is that while we are debating this, we are selling wheat to the Soviets, who happen to be Communists. We are selling Pepsi-Cola to the Red Chinese, who happen to be at least Marxists. The gentleman is drawing lines here about where we are going to be involved. I think he is going to find himself in a difficult predicament in trying to decide who are the enemies and who are the friends of the United States of America.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker, as I understand it, made reference to me. I would like to have his words taken down regarding my performance here on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Is too late for that, the Chair will advise. Further debate has intervened.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I tried to get the attention of the Chair before he concluded. The Chair was busy up there paying attention to someone else.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will announce that both gentlemen have 12 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, we have attempted to keep this on an unemotional tone. I have had one speaker canceled for 1 minute and I would in the spirit of cooperation yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to make a response.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. The only point that I wanted to make, the gentleman from California was—

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Florida require unanimous consent to do that?

The CHAIRMAN. No. The gentleman controls the time and has a perfectly legitimate right to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I appreciate his courtesy on it. It is too bad that we cannot get more people to yield here.

I just wanted to point out that the State Department has sent me a letter. This is from J. Edward Fox, Assistant Secretary, who says:

I believe the State Department's position on travel is in sync with the intent of your amendment. We continue to discourage travel to that region because of the existent hostilities which could impose dangers to American travelers.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Certainly, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, just briefly, is it not correct that it would be an accurate statement to say that the administration did not request this amendment?

Mr. WALKER. That is very accurate and they have objections to some of the administrative problems with it, but they do not have a problem with the intent, which is what most people seem to be speaking to.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, to reclaim my time, I will vote against the amendment, but I am doing my very best to keep it as fair and open as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] put their fingers on it. The right to travel is something that is very precious in the United States. It is almost a constitutional right. We have the right to travel anywhere in the world and that is why we consider this a free country. That differentiates us from other countries.

Now, in the subcommittee that I chair that has to do with the FBI and oversight of the FBI, in the past 2 years we have had a lot of complaints that the FBI was interviewing people who have been traveling, Americans who have the right to travel anywhere they want to, who have been to Nicaragua. In over a hundred instances as people got off the airplanes from Cen-

tral America, from Nicaragua, they were greeted by a message from the FBI, saying that the FBI wants to talk to you.

Well, this amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and amended by unanimous consent will make certain that up to 8,000 Americans a year, that is how many travel to Nicaragua, are going to be greeted by an FBI agent when they get off to find out what they were doing there. Perhaps they can be interviewed before they go to Nicaragua, because of the possible intention of going there for illegal purposes, as would be established in this amendment.

So this is not only an amendment designed to do great damage the freedom of choice of Americans insofar as traveling anywhere in the world, but it is also going to have a very chilling effect on people who want to decide to go there for any particular purpose at all because they know that the FBI is going to be very interested in them, either before or after they return.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we were talking here a few minutes ago about drawing lines about what is appropriate and what is not appropriate for travel. Let me draw the lines and maybe someone on the other side could respond.

Mr. Paul Rice stated that if we ever had to send troops into Nicaragua, they are going to die. This is an American. They are going to die. "Me and plenty of others like me are going to defend this place. It doesn't matter who invades, Marines or not, we are going to kill people."

How about Mr. Ken Norworthy, another American in Nicaragua, who said:

I would certainly pick up a gun and defend myself in this resolution. To me an invading GI is just a Contra.

I might ask someone on the other side of this issue if they could indicate to me whether that would be sufficient means to stop travel into Nicaragua. I do not see anybody responding.

The point is, right now the issue is very clear. Right now what we are trying to do in this country is make it a crime to fight communism, but OK to aid it. That is essentially what this issue is.

If you cannot support the Walker amendment, as amended, then what you are saying is that it is OK to aid communism in Central America.

Nobody is talking about people on an irrigation project, but if you knew that somebody was going over to Nicaragua and helping the Communists in Nicaragua and knowing that they were going to help those Communists to be

able to kill American GI's, is that a good reason to stop travel? I maintain that it is. I would like to have someone maintain that it is not, because if it is not, if you say that it is not, then you should be for the Walker amendment.

Again, I would like to quote from Norman Podhoretz in a recent editorial where he said that it is necessary from time to time to remind ourselves that the issue is the struggle not between the Contras and the Sandinistas. Really the issue is the struggle between communism and freedom in Central America. That is what the issue is. That is where it ought to be framed.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

□ 1725

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, one of the problems in this amendment, even as amended, as indicated by the gentleman from California earlier, is that it is extremely vague. It would prohibit or restrict passports for travel to and use in Nicaragua if the purpose of the travel is "to perform services or provide other assistance," undefined, "to the military operations of the Government of Nicaragua." And it is for that reason that the State Department, among other reasons, has decided not to support this amendment.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania quoted accurately from the State Department letter to him dated yesterday, which says, "I believe the State Department's position on travel is in sync with the intent of your amendment."

However, here is what they said as to their position on the amendment itself:

As I indicated to you previously, there are a number of administrative and technical reasons which make us unable to support your amendment to the State Authorization bill on travel to Nicaragua. We believe that such passport designations would be virtually impossible to implement or enforce. Moreover, we already possess sufficient legal means to place restrictions in U.S. passports should conditions warrant.

I think that this is one of those instances where we really ought to listen to the State Department and leave well enough alone.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this is a very reasonable amendment. I think that it handles the problem in a most humane way, in an efficient way, and without treading on the constitutional rights that were evoked in the last debate, namely, the right not to be on a list.

In listening to the testimony of Mr. Linder's parents, who talked about the fact that although he carried an AK-

47, he was down there on a so-called humane mission, and he was killed they think by a Contra policy that is unjustly supported by the United States, for those people who feel that way, who feel in sympathy with Mr. Linder's parents, this is the most humane thing that you can do, because this will keep people away who, as the gentleman from New Hampshire has quoted, have said, "I will kill Americans if I have to. I'm going to go down and fight for the revolution. I'm going to support the Sandinistas."

I quoted some of the statements that were made the other day by a gentleman, Mr. Ron Ridenour, who said, "I will kill American Marines. That's my duty if they come."

The policy of this Congress is to support the resistance. We have voted in the House, in the Senate, and the President has signed the bill, to send \$100 million to the resistance, to the people fighting the Communists in Nicaragua. It does not make sense for us to say on the other hand if Americans want to go down and take up AK-47's and kill resistance fighters and fight on the side of the Communists, then we will allow that.

This is not a question of free travel. Nobody is over talking about General Secord's rights to free travel. Nobody is talking about Ollie North's right to be kept off a list. This is a Boland amendment of the left, and it is absolutely appropriate in this situation.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CROCKETT].

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Walker amendment. The amendment would restrict the travel of United States citizens to Nicaragua if their purpose is to assist the Nicaraguan Government and from traveling anywhere in Central America if the purpose is to assist a group which the President has designated as a Communist guerrilla group.

Simply put, this amendment is an assault on the civil liberties of American citizens. In 1958, in *Kent versus Dulles*, the Supreme Court identified the right to travel as a liberty protected under the due process clause of the fifth amendment.

The right to travel outside the United States is also crucial to Americans' ability to be well-informed concerning U.S. foreign policy. Indeed, the right to travel provides meaning and substance by insuring that Americans can gather firsthand information on foreign policy matters.

Moreover, as a signatory to the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, the United States formally committed itself to facilitating wider travel of its citizens abroad. Contrary to this goal and the expressed intent of Congress, the Walker amendment threatens this right of



American citizens to travel and gather information abroad.

Finally, in 1978 the Congress amended the Passport Act to preserve American citizens freedom of travel and to prevent the use of U.S. passport policy to restrict travel to certain countries solely for political or ideological reasons. The amendment also ended the Executive practice of restricting the use of passports to areas of the world cordoned off for foreign policy reasons. Consequently, the Passport Act, as amended, grants the President sole authority to restrict the travel of Americans abroad under the following conditions only: Those countries with which the United States is at war, where armed hostilities are in progress, or where there is imminent danger to the public health or physical safety of American citizens. The Passport Act provides the Executive with ample authority to curtail travel when it is necessary to protect Americans abroad. Mr. WALKER's amendment would, therefore, usurp the authority of the President.

There are an estimated 1,500 to 2,000 United States residents in Nicaragua. These Americans are joined by thousands of other volunteers from all over the globe, who are working on a wide variety of development projects.

They are there because they believe it is the right thing to do. Benjamin Linder, the young American engineer recently killed in Nicaragua, was in that country because he wanted to bring the benefits of electrification to the rural population. They are there not to engage in activities contrary to the interests of United States foreign policy, but to help the people of Nicaragua. Americans have always been willing to give of themselves in this manner all over the world. All of us remember the Americans who went to Spain to fight in the Spanish Civil War. We had American heroes who went to Canada to volunteer to go abroad to defend Britain in World War II. This is a cherished constitutional right that we should not make any attempt to deprive American citizens of by this amendment.

Travel to Nicaragua and other Central American countries is a matter that must rightly be left to the conscience of these and other individuals. Mr. WALKER may strongly disagree with the choice they have made, but it is their choice—not the Congress'—to make.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I simply say in reply to the gentleman, this would be the equal of Americans going to Europe to help the Nazi regime at that point, and that is what we are trying to prevent right here.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, let me say first of all that I am fascinated with those of our friends on the left who continue to speak and oppose the Walker amendment as amended. I personally thought that when the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] offered an amendment that narrowed it down only to restrict Americans from going to Nicaragua to help a Communist dictatorship militarily that even our looniest friends on the left would collapse, that we would get a 420-to-5 vote or something passed with great quietness.

Instead we find an enthusiastic desire to pretend that there is a symmetry, and I say this to my friend from Illinois who seemed earlier to be confused, if I could get his attention. I direct this to him since he seemed offended by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

I find it appalling that some of our friends on the left would use the word, as the gentleman did earlier, about symmetry. I do not think that there is symmetry between a Communist dictatorship which is an extension of the Soviet empire and people who want freedom. I do not think that there is a symmetry between Lafayette and Lenin. I do not think that there is a symmetry in any way between saying that we want to encourage free people everywhere and we want to stop Americans from helping communism.

I find it appalling that some of our friends on the left would talk in that symmetry, but let me carry it a stage further. The fact is, and I would cite Norman Podhoretz' article, "Is it a crime to Fight Communism, but Okay to Aid It?" that we are now in a situation in America where if you are an active anti-Communist, you may go to jail, and if you are an active pro-Communist, you may be applauded. That is reality.

The fact is, and I cite for example the article by Stephen Rosenfeld, "A Mobilization Against Democracy," that there are active hard-left forces in the United States which would cheerfully, enthusiastically, applaud the victory of communism in Central America on every front and in every country. And the fact is that some of those forces are active allies of the Communist Party of the United States, and some of those forces actively coordinate with the Soviet Union.

The fact is, if you look at Jeane Kirkpatrick's article, "Another Popular Front," you again find the same pattern of a systematic willingness to be helpful to the forces of communism.

□ 1735

Let me suggest to all of my colleagues there is an interesting new book out called "The Real Secret War Sandinista Political Warfare and Its

Effects on Congress" by Bouche, Waller, and Baldwin. It is worth reading. We are back to where we were in the late 1940's when Hubert Humphrey had to purge the DLF of the Communists, and the then Democrat, Ronald Reagan, had to purge the artists associations of Communists. And the fact is even some of the Members of this House have on occasion publicized the propaganda of paid agents of Nicaraguan communism.

The test vote on the Walker amendment is simple. How many of my colleagues are willing to walk down and proudly put up a vote that says I want to make it possible for well meaning but misguided Americans to go to Nicaragua, to die on behalf of Nicaraguan communism at the direction of Cuban and Soviet advisers? That is exactly what that means.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman put the State Department to that position too, because they do not support this, they say they cannot support this amendment.

Mr. GINGRICH. There are elements in the State Department, I say to my friend, who do not to this day believe that the Soviet empire exists, and who do not to this day understand the nature of communism. Many of them, I am sure, when they get out, when they retire, will find themselves cheerfully walking in mobilization marches. The gentleman is right and he raised the right issue.

We happen to think that had the State Department been honest and explicit for the last 6 months, had it been courageous and willing to drop "Sandinista" and use "Communist," and had it been willing to focus on the Soviet empire, we frankly would have won the argument in America a long time ago that it is the institutional bureaucracy combined with a well meaning economic left, working with a not at all well meaning hard left that has left America so confused and so weak.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER].

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will require the State Department to ask every citizen seeking a passport why are you going. It will give the Department of State the right to deny to every citizen of this country a passport if that question is for some reason in question.

This amendment imposes an ideological litmus test on those Americans seeking to exercise their constitutional rights. It is clear that the minority in the House is now trying to restrict the right of Americans to travel.

Last night we heard the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] on tele-

vision when he was asked, "Mr. GINGRICH, do you want the truth to come out of these hearings on the Iran-Contra matter," and the gentleman from Georgia, my colleague, replied, "Not necessarily."

I think it is clear that now there is a concern that the truth is coming out. This effort to restrict travel, this effort to restrict the truth is I think of great concern. This is the same gentleman who described in a newspaper article yesterday three Members of the U.S. Senate, as part of a leftwing lynch mob attacking the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman should not refer to Members of the other body and should revise his remarks.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Three Members of the other body who shall remain nameless.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman should still not refer to Members of the other body.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. We ought to be concerned, Mr. Chairman, in this House where we try to protect the constitutionally guaranteed liberties of the American people of any amendment which would restrict the right to travel based on the citizens' ideological convictions.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOSTMAYER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a direct question. If he knew an American citizen was going to Nicaragua to fight alongside Cubans under Soviet advisers in favor of tyranny, would he be willing to stop them from going and fighting for communism?

Mr. KOSTMAYER. If we are not at war with Nicaragua and American lives are not in danger, American Marines were mentioned, and we were not at war, then I do not think it is any of Congress' business to decide why Americans travel and where they travel. That is not our judgment to make.

The issue was raised as to whether or not people go there to participate in farm work, to raise food, which would go to the Sandinista army, would they be restricted from traveling as well. This is a very dangerous area. I am not a supporter of the Sandinistas, but this is a dangerous area in which the Congress seeks to limit the right to travel.

This amendment is better defeated.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. My colleagues, we are in a very dangerous area and we are skirting all sorts of issues here. But I think that we are going to need a bipartisan approach to decide what we are going to do about wars of liberation, and that is what

they are described as on both sides, and whether it is any of our business, as the gentleman said, whether Americans want to choose up sides, as the chairman of my Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere began to discuss on the Spanish Civil War.

Americans fought on both sides of the Spanish Civil War. Only the strangely named Abraham Lincoln Brigade gets lionized on national television by Pierre Salinger. The other side is not too well talked about, the side that tried to stop the murdering of the priests and the nuns.

Both sides of the Spanish Civil War, both sides got into a rather ugly situation where both sides slaughtered prisoners wholesale. So there is not too much pride to be taken on either side of that.

Then about 2 or 3 years later one American went over to work for the Japanese warlords. She eventually did time. We did not murder her or kill her as the British killed Lord HaHa, but we put Tokyo Rose in jail.

On the other side there were American military pilots deviously secunded, Army Air Corps, Navy pilots to the Flying Tigers to get \$500 for every Japanese Zero they shot down. They were fighting for China against Japan, and there was no declaration of war.

In this Chamber we have a picture hanging of a man that Robespierre called a mercenary, Lafayette. He came as a young man in his early twenties to fight in a revolution against a strong country in Europe. He was a Contra in that sense. Was his travel restricted by France? No.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has expired.

Mr. DORNAN of California. 5:45 and we are discussing an issue of this import without enough time. I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] has 1 minute remaining and has the right to conclude debate.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, a point of information. We have worked out an agreement where by unanimous consent I will have 2 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] will close debate with his 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida make that unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this gentleman have 1 additional minute of debate time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, do I understand, though, that this side will have the chance to close debate?

The CHAIRMAN. That was part of the unanimous-consent request. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is granted 1 additional minute, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] will close the debate.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment is is a continuum of a sad state of affairs where those who say they are so interested in democracy in Nicaragua are willing to undermine the democratic institutions here at home, and those who care so much and are in favor of freedom and civil liberties in Nicaragua will undermine and constrict the freedoms of Americans here at home.

What this amendment then really is about is that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are afraid of the American people, they are afraid of people who have gone down to Nicaragua, have talked to people, who have engaged in work programs and discussed with members of the government all the different factions, and have come home and have lectured to their neighbors and to their congregations about how stupid, how brutal the American policy is in Nicaragua. What we now find is in the most recent polls over 70 percent of the American people oppose the policy of this administration, and this is a last ditch effort by taking away Americans' freedom to travel, their civil liberties and the democratic institutions to try to overcome what the majority of the American people want us to do, and that is to end this administration's policy in Nicaragua.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCloskey].

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate, but it has been attempted, and some will try to do this in the future, to say that this vote is really about whether you are for or against the Contras or the Sandinistas or whatever. The truth is nothing could be further from the truth.

The simple fact is first that the administration opposes this legislation for whatever reason, it opposes it for procedural and administrative reasons.

Secondly, the people who are pushing this amendment are trying to deprive American citizens of human rights that the administration is not trying to take away. As the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] so eloquently pointed out the other day, whether he agrees or not, the values of pro-Sandinista Americans may be appalling, but they have the right to have those values.



I urge a very strong no vote and that we defeat this amendment which seeks to deprive Americans of civil rights that the administration has not sought to do.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, Americans are currently restricted from working in any capacity in Libya or Cuba. This amendment is not unique. We restrict military advisers from the United States at least 20 miles from the Nicaraguan border. So what in the world is wrong with trying to keep Americans from going down there and participating in a military capacity with the Communists in Nicaragua?

Would my colleagues on the left fight as hard for the rights of U.S. citizens to go down and help the freedom fighters, the Contras? I think not.

The problem in this body is, and the problem with many elected in this country, is they want to make it a crime to fight communism, but it is OK to aid the Communists.

We have got to get back on the right track in this country. My colleagues on the left need to admit forthrightly that they support the Communist Sandinista government of Nicaragua and quit this charade that they try to put forth on the American people every day of the week.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the last three-quarters of a minute to close debate.

Mr. Chairman, there is no violation whatsoever here of any right to travel or any freedom to travel, none whatsoever. It is perfectly in line with the laws that are now on the books. As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] just mentioned, such is being applied in Libya and Cuba today.

I never believed that I would hear on this floor someone suggest there is a human right of Americans to go fight for the Communists in Central America, but we just heard that a minute ago. That is not a human right. The human right is the freedom to travel. That is not impacted upon at all by this amendment.

If my colleagues vote against this amendment they are saying clearly that they have no problem with Americans going to Central America to help the Soviet and Cuban Communists with their military operations. This is an amendment not only aimed at Nicaragua, I would say, it is aimed at those Communist guerrilla groups that are also fighting against embryonic democracies. You will be voting to say people ought to go from America to Central America and fight on the side of the Communist guerrillas that are trying to overthrow the embryonic de-

mocracies, and I would suggest that is a terrible vote.

Vote "yes" on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], as modified.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 201, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

#### AYES—213

Andrews	Gregg	Pashayan
Archer	Gunderson	Penny
Armey	Hall (OH)	Pickle
Aspin	Hall (TX)	Porter
Baker	Hammerschmidt	Quillen
Ballenger	Hansen	Ravenel
Barnard	Harris	Regula
Bartlett	Hastert	Rhodes
Barton	Hatcher	Ridge
Bateman	Hefley	Rinaldo
Bennett	Hefner	Ritter
Bentley	Henry	Roberts
Bevill	Herger	Robinson
Biaggi	Hiler	Rogers
Billrakis	Holloway	Roth
Bliley	Hopkins	Roukema
Boehert	Horton	Rowland (CT)
Boulter	Hubbard	Rowland (GA)
Broomfield	Huckaby	Saiki
Brown (CO)	Hunter	Saxton
Buechner	Hutto	Schaefer
Bunning	Hyde	Schuette
Burton	Inhofe	Schulze
Byron	Ireland	Sensenbrenner
Callahan	Jenkins	Shaw
Carper	Johnson (CT)	Shumway
Chandler	Kasich	Shuster
Chapman	Kolbe	Skeen
Chappell	Kolter	Skelton
Cheney	Konnyu	Slattery
Coats	Kyl	Slaughter (VA)
Coble	Lagomarsino	Smith (NE)
Coleman (MO)	Lancaster	Smith (NJ)
Combest	Latta	Smith (TX)
Conte	Leach (IA)	Smith, Denny
Coughlin	Leath (TX)	(OR)
Courter	Lent	Smith, Robert
Craig	Lewis (CA)	(NH)
Crane	Lewis (FL)	Smith, Robert
Dannemeyer	Lightfoot	(OR)
Darden	Livingston	Snowe
Daub	Lloyd	Solomon
Davis (IL)	Lott	Spence
DeLay	Lowery (CA)	Stangeland
DeWine	Lujan	Stenholm
Dickinson	Lungren	Stratton
DioGuardi	Mack	Stump
Dornan (CA)	Madigan	Sundquist
Dowdy	Marlenee	Sweeney
Dreier	Martin (NY)	Swindall
Duncan	McCandless	Tallon
Dyson	McCollum	Tauke
Edwards (OK)	McDade	Taylor
Emerson	McEwen	Thomas (CA)
English	McGrath	Thomas (GA)
Erdreich	McMillan (NC)	Upton
Fawell	Meyers	Valentine
Fields	Michel	Vander Jagt
Fish	Miller (OH)	Volkmmer
Frenzel	Miller (WA)	Vucanovich
Frost	Molinar	Walker
Gallely	Montgomery	Watkins
Gallo	Moorhead	Weber
Gaydos	Morrison (WA)	Weldon
Gekas	Murphy	Whittaker
Gibbons	Myers	Wilson
Gilman	Nelson	Wolf
Gingrich	Nichols	Wortley
Goodling	Nielson	Wylie
Grandy	Obey	Yatron
Grant	Oxley	Young (AK)
Green	Parris	Young (FL)

#### NOES—201

Ackerman	Gephardt	Nowak
Akaka	Glickman	Oakar
Alexander	Gonzalez	Oberstar
Anderson	Gordon	Olin
Annunzio	Gradison	Ortiz
Anthony	Gray (IL)	Owens (NY)
Applegate	Guarini	Owens (UT)
Atkins	Hamilton	Panetta
AuCoin	Hawkins	Patterson
Bates	Hayes (IL)	Pease
Bellenson	Hayes (LA)	Pelosi
Bereuter	Hertel	Pepper
Berman	Hochbrueckner	Perkins
Bilbray	Houghton	Petri
Boggs	Howard	Pickett
Boland	Hoyer	Price (IL)
Bonker	Hughes	Price (NC)
Borski	Jacobs	Pursell
Bosco	Johnson (SD)	Rahall
Boucher	Jones (NC)	Rangel
Boxer	Jones (TN)	Richardson
Brennan	Jontz	Rodino
Brooks	Kanjorski	Roe
Brown (CA)	Kaptur	Rose
Bruce	Kastenmeier	Rostenkowski
Bryant	Kennedy	Roybal
Bustamante	Kennelly	Russo
Campbell	Kildee	Sabo
Cardin	Klecza	Savage
Carr	Kostmayer	Sawyer
Clarke	LaFalce	Scheuer
Clay	Lantos	Schneider
Clinger	Lehman (CA)	Schroeder
Coelho	Lehman (FL)	Sharp
Coleman (TX)	Leland	Sikorski
Collins	Levin (MI)	Sisisky
Conyers	Levine (CA)	Skaggs
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter (NY)
Coyne	Lipinski	Smith (IA)
Crockett	Lowry (WA)	Solarz
Davis (MI)	Luken, Thomas	Spratt
de la Garza	MacKay	St Germain
DeFazio	Manton	Staggers
Dellums	Markey	Stallings
Derrick	Martin (IL)	Stark
Dicks	Martinez	Stokes
Dingell	Matsui	Studds
Dixon	Mavroules	Swift
Donnelly	Mazzoli	Synar
Dorgan (ND)	McCloskey	Torres
Downey	McCurdy	Torricelli
Durbin	McHugh	Towns
Dwyer	McMillen (MD)	Trafiacant
Early	Mfume	Traxler
Eckart	Mica	Udall
Edwards (CA)	Miller (CA)	Vento
Espy	Mineta	Visclosky
Evans	Moakley	Walgren
Fascell	Mollohan	Waxman
Fazio	Moody	Weiss
Feighan	Morella	Wheat
Florio	Morrison (CT)	Whitten
Foley	Mrazek	Williams
Ford (MI)	Murtha	Wise
Frank	Nagle	Wolpe
Garcia	Natcher	Wyden
Gejdenson	Neal	Yates

#### NOT VOTING—19

Badham	Foglietta	Ray
Boner (TN)	Ford (TN)	Roemer
Bonior (MI)	Gray (PA)	Schumer
Daniel	Jeffords	Smith (FL)
Dymally	Kemp	Tauzin
Flake	Lukens, Donald	
Flipppo	Packard	

#### □ 1805

Messrs. SMITH of Iowa, McHUGH, and VENTO changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. BARNARD, NICHOLS, DANNEMEYER, BEVILL, BAKER, HOPKINS, CONTE, DOWDY of Mississippi, and HORTON, and Mrs. BYRON changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

Mr. PACKARD. I was unable to vote during the session. Had I been present, I would have voted no.

So the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COELHO] having assumed the chair, Mr. SWIFT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1777) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1988 and 1989 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 190, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Herger amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the following amendments:

The Levine amendment regarding the Pan American Health Organization;

The Richardson amendment regarding Cuban political prisoners;

The Richardson amendment concerning human rights abuses in Ethiopia and Paraguay;

The Oberstar amendment regarding consulates in Germany, Sweden, Italy, France, and Austria; and

The Neal amendment, as amended, regarding Japanese defense expenditures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

The Chair will put the votes in the following order; first, the Levine amendment; second, the Oberstar amendment; third, the Richardson amendment No. 6; fourth, the Richardson amendment No. 8; fifth, the Herger amendment; and sixth, the Neal amendment.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRENZEL. Will the Clerk read the amendments prior to the vote on each?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report each amendment in the order in which they appear in the bill.

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following a record vote on this amendment the time for record votes on the remaining amendments be reduced to 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 4, line 12, strike "\$1,375,974,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,373,024,000".

Page 4, line 13, strike "\$1,431,013,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,428,063,000".

Page 9, line 5, strike "\$32,691,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$37,191,000".

Page 9, line 6, strike "\$33,999,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$38,499,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 313, noes 99, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

#### AYES—313

Ackerman	Boucher	Courter
Akaka	Boxer	Coyne
Alexander	Brennan	Crockett
Anderson	Brooks	Darden
Andrews	Brown (CA)	Daub
Annunzio	Bruce	Davis (MI)
Anthony	Bryant	de la Garza
Applegate	Bustamante	DeFazio
Atkins	Byron	Dellums
AuCoin	Callahan	Derrick
Barnard	Campbell	Dicks
Bartlett	Cardin	Dingell
Barton	Carper	DioGuardi
Bates	Carr	Dixon
Beilenson	Chapman	Donnelly
Bennett	Chappell	Dorgan (ND)
Berman	Cheney	Dowdy
Bevill	Clarke	Downey
Biaggi	Clay	Durbin
Bilbray	Coats	Dwyer
Bliley	Coelho	Dyson
Boehert	Coleman (TX)	Early
Boggs	Collins	Eckart
Boland	Combest	Edwards (CA)
Bonker	Conte	English
Borski	Conyers	Erdreich
Bosco	Cooper	Espy
	Coughlin	Evans

Fascell	Lipinski	Rostenkowski
Fawell	Lloyd	Roth
Fazio	Lott	Roukema
Feighan	Lowery (CA)	Rowland (CT)
Fish	Lowry (WA)	Rowland (GA)
Florio	Lujan	Roybal
Foley	Luken, Thomas	Russo
Ford (MI)	MacKay	Sabo
Frank	Madigan	Saiki
Frost	Manton	Savage
Gallo	Markey	Sawyer
Garcia	Marlenee	Saxton
Gaydos	Martin (NY)	Scheuer
Gejdenson	Martinez	Schneider
Gibbons	Matsui	Schroeder
Gilman	Mavroules	Schulze
Gingrich	Mazzoli	Schulze
Glickman	McCloskey	Sharp
Gonzalez	McCurdy	Shaw
Goodling	McDade	Shuster
Gordon	McGrath	Sikorski
Gradison	McHugh	Siskis
Grant	McMillan (NC)	Skaggs
Gray (IL)	McMillen (MD)	Skelton
Green	Mfume	Slattery
Guarini	Mica	Slaughter (NY)
Hall (OH)	Michel	Smith (NJ)
Hall (TX)	Miller (CA)	Smith (TX)
Hamilton	Miller (WA)	Smith, Robert
Harris	Mineta	(OR)
Hatcher	Moakley	Snowe
Hawkins	Mollohan	Solarz
Hayes (IL)	Montgomery	Spence
Hayes (LA)	Morella	Spratt
Hefner	Morrison (CT)	St Germain
Henry	Morrison (WA)	Staggers
Herger	Mrazek	Stallings
Hertel	Murphy	Stark
Hiler	Murtha	Stenholm
Hochbrueckner	Nagle	Stokes
Horton	Natcher	Stratton
Houghton	Neal	Studds
Howard	Nelson	Swift
Hoyer	Nichols	Swindall
Hubbard	Nowak	Synar
Huckaby	Oaker	Tallon
Hughes	Oberstar	Thomas (GA)
Hutto	Obey	Torres
Inhofe	Olin	Torricelli
Jacobs	Ortiz	Towns
Jenkins	Owens (NY)	Trafficant
Johnson (SD)	Owens (UT)	Traxler
Jones (NC)	Oxley	Udall
Jones (TN)	Panetta	Upton
Jontz	Parris	Valentine
Kanjorski	Pashayan	Vento
Kaptur	Patterson	Visclosky
Kasich	Pease	Volkmer
Kastenmeier	Pelosi	Walgren
Kennedy	Penny	Watkins
Kennelly	Pepper	Waxman
Kildee	Perkins	Weber
Kieccka	Pickett	Weiss
Kolter	Pickle	Weldon
Kostmayer	Porter	Wheat
LaFalce	Price (IL)	Whitten
Lancaster	Price (NC)	Williams
Lantos	Rahall	Wilson
Leach (IA)	Rangel	Wise
Leath (TX)	Ravenel	Wolf
Lehman (CA)	Richardson	Wolpe
Lehman (FL)	Ridge	Wortley
Leland	Rinaldo	Wyden
Lent	Rodino	Yates
Levin (MI)	Roe	Yatron
Levine (CA)	Rogers	Young (AK)
Lewis (GA)	Rose	

#### NOES—99

Archer	Coble	Gallegly
Armey	Coleman (MO)	Gekas
Baker	Craig	Grandy
Ballenger	Crane	Gregg
Bateman	Dannemeyer	Gunderson
Bentley	Davis (IL)	Hammerschmidt
Bereuter	DeLay	Hansen
Bilirakis	DeWine	Hastert
Boulter	Dickinson	Hefley
Broomfield	Dornan (CA)	Holloway
Brown (CO)	Dreier	Hopkins
Buechner	Duncan	Hunter
Bunning	Edwards (OK)	Hyde
Burton	Emerson	Ireland
Chandler	Fields	Johnson (CT)
Clinger	Frenzel	Kolbe



Konnyu  
Kyl  
Lagomarsino  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (FL)  
Lightfoot  
Livingston  
Lungren  
Mack  
Martin (IL)  
McCandless  
McCullum  
McEwen  
Meyers  
Miller (OH)  
Mollinari  
Moody

Moorhead  
Myers  
Nielsen  
Petri  
Quillen  
Regula  
Rhodes  
Ritter  
Roberts  
Robinson  
Schaefer  
Sensenbrenner  
Shumway  
Skeen  
Slaughter (VA)  
Smith (IA)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith, Denny (OR)

Smith, Robert (NH)  
Solomon  
Stangeland  
Stump  
Sundquist  
Sweeney  
Taufe  
Taylor  
Thomas (CA)  
Vander Jagt  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Whittaker  
Wylie  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—21

Badham  
Boner (TN)  
Bonior (MI)  
Daniel  
Dymally  
Flake  
Flippo

Foglietta  
Ford (TN)  
Gephardt  
Gray (PA)  
Jeffords  
Kemp  
Lukens, Donald

Packard  
Pursell  
Ray  
Roemer  
Schumer  
Smith (FL)  
Tauzin

## □ 1820

Mr. ROBINSON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. STRATTON, COYNE and SWINDALL changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## □ 1835

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. COELHO). The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 27, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 137. FUNDS TO KEEP CERTAIN CONSULATES OPEN.

In addition to the amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated, there are authorized to be appropriated for "Salaries and Expenses" for the Department of State \$3,100,000 for each of the fiscal years 1988 and 1989, which amounts shall be used for the expenses necessary to continue to operate those consulates in Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, and Sweden which are currently scheduled to be closed during fiscal year 1987.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all further votes be limited to 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 171, not voting 21, as follows:

## [Roll No. 207]

## AYES—241

Ackerman  
Akaka  
Alexander  
Anderson  
Andrews  
Annunzio  
Anthony  
Applegate  
Aspin  
Atkins  
AuCoin  
Bateman  
Bellenson  
Bennett  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Biaggi  
Bilbray  
Boggs  
Bonker  
Borski  
Bosco  
Boucher  
Boxer  
Brennan  
Brooks  
Broomfield  
Brown (CA)  
Bruce  
Bryant  
Bustamante  
Campbell  
Cardin  
Carper  
Chapman  
Chappell  
Clarke  
Clay  
Coelho  
Coleman (MO)  
Coleman (TX)  
Collins  
Conyers  
Coughlin  
Coyne  
Crockett  
Darden  
Davis (MI)  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
Dellums  
Dicks  
Dingell  
DioGuardi  
Dixon  
Donnelly  
Dorgan (ND)  
Dowdy  
Downey  
Durbine  
Dwyer  
Eckart  
Edwards (CA)  
Espy  
Evans  
Fascell  
Fazio  
Feighan  
Fish  
Florio  
Foley  
Ford (MI)  
Frost  
Garcia  
Gaydos  
Gedden  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Gradison

Grant  
Gray (IL)  
Gray (PA)  
Guarini  
Hamilton  
Hatcher  
Hawkins  
Hayes (IL)  
Hayes (LA)  
Hefner  
Herger  
Hertel  
Hochbrueckner  
Horton  
Howard  
Hoyer  
Hughes  
Hutto  
Jacobs  
Jenkins  
Johnson (SD)  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (TN)  
Jontz  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kastenmeier  
Kennelly  
Kleczka  
Kolter  
Kostmayer  
LaFalce  
Lagomarsino  
Lancaster  
Lantos  
Leach (IA)  
Lehman (CA)  
Lehman (FL)  
Leland  
Levin (MI)  
Levine (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lowry (WA)  
Lukens, Thomas  
MacKay  
Manton  
Markay  
Martin (IL)  
Martinez  
Matsui  
Mavroules  
Mazzoli  
McCloskey  
McDade  
McGrath  
McHugh  
McMillen (MD)  
Mfume  
Mica  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Moody  
Morrison (WA)  
Mrazek  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Nagle  
Natcher  
Neal  
Nelson  
Nowak  
Oakar  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olin  
Ortiz  
Owens (NY)

Owens (UT)  
Oxley  
Panetta  
Pease  
Pelosi  
Penny  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Pickett  
Pickle  
Price (IL)  
Price (NC)  
Richardson  
Ridge  
Rinaldo  
Roberts  
Rodino  
Roe  
Rose  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Rowland (GA)  
Roybal  
Russo  
Sabo  
Savage  
Sawyer  
Scheuer  
Schneider  
Sensenbrenner  
Sharp  
Shuster  
Sikorski  
Skaggs  
Skelton  
Slaughter (NY)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith, Robert (OR)  
Solarz  
Spratt  
St Germain  
Stallings  
Stangeland  
Stark  
Stokes  
Stratton  
Studds  
Swift  
Synar  
Tallon  
Thomas (GA)  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traficant  
Traxler  
Udall  
Valentine  
Vander Jagt  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Walgren  
Waxman  
Weber  
Weiss  
Wheat  
Whittaker  
Whitten  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Wolpe  
Wortley  
Wyden  
Yates  
Yatron  
Young (AK)

## NOES—171

Archer  
Army  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barnard  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bates  
Bentley

Bilirakis  
Bliley  
Boehlert  
Boland  
Boulter  
Brown (CO)  
Buechner  
Bunning  
Burton

Byron  
Callahan  
Carr  
Chandler  
Cheney  
Clinger  
Coats  
Coble  
Combest

Conte  
Cooper  
Courtner  
Craig  
Crane  
Dannemeyer  
Daub  
Davis (IL)  
DeLay  
Derrick  
DeWine  
Dickinson  
Dornan (CA)  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dyson  
Early  
Edwards (OK)  
Emerson  
English  
Erdreich  
Fawell  
Fields  
Frank  
Frenzel  
Gallegly  
Gallo  
Gekas  
Gibbons  
Gingrich  
Glickman  
Goodling  
Grandy  
Green  
Gregg  
Gunderson  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hammerschmidt  
Hansen  
Harris  
Hastert  
Hefley  
Henry  
Hiler  
Holloway  
Hopkins  
Houghton  
Hubbard

Huckaby  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inhofe  
Ireland  
Johnson (CT)  
Kasich  
Kennedy  
Kolbe  
Konnyu  
Kyl  
Latta  
Leath (TX)  
Lent  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (FL)  
Lightfoot  
Livingston  
Lloyd  
Lott  
Lowery (CA)  
Lujan  
Lungren  
Mack  
Madigan  
Marlenee  
Martin (NY)  
McCandless  
McCullum  
McCurdy  
McEwen  
McMillan (NC)  
Meyers  
Michel  
Miller (OH)  
Miller (WA)  
Mollinari  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Morella  
Morrison (CT)  
Myers  
Nichols  
Nielsen  
Parris  
Pashayan  
Patterson  
Petri  
Porter

Quillen  
Rahall  
Ravenel  
Regula  
Rhodes  
Ritter  
Robinson  
Rogers  
Roukema  
Rowland (CT)  
Salki  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Schroeder  
Schuette  
Schulze  
Shaw  
Shumway  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Slattery  
Slaughter (VA)  
Smith (IA)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith, Denny (OR)  
Smith, Robert (NH)  
Snowe  
Solomon  
Spence  
Staggers  
Stenholm  
Stump  
Sundquist  
Sweeney  
Swindall  
Taufe  
Taylor  
Thomas (CA)  
Upton  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Watkins  
Weldon  
Wylie  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—21

Badham  
Boner (TN)  
Bonior (MI)  
Daniel  
Dymally  
Flake  
Flippo

Foglietta  
Ford (TN)  
Gephardt  
Jeffords  
Kemp  
Lukens, Donald  
Packard

Pursell  
Rangel  
Ray  
Roemer  
Schumer  
Smith (FL)  
Tauzin

## □ 1845

Messrs. HALL of Ohio, NICHOLS, HARRIS, and SLATTERY changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. COELHO). The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Herger amendment, which would have been the last amendment, be voted on out of order as the next amendment, and that after that, without prejudice to the outcome of that vote, each of the remaining votes on amendments be reduced to 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Herger amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 58, strike out lines 3 through 12 (section 203), and redesignate succeeding sections accordingly.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. **HERGER**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 230, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

#### AYES—180

Andrews	Gregg	Patterson
Archer	Hall (TX)	Porter
Armey	Hammerschmidt	Pursell
Baker	Hansen	Quillen
Ballenger	Harris	Rahall
Bartlett	Hastert	Ravenel
Barton	Hefley	Regula
Bateman	Henry	Rhodes
Bentley	Herger	Rinaldo
Bevill	Hiler	Roberts
Billrakis	Holloway	Robinson
Bliley	Hopkins	Rogers
Boland	Houghton	Roth
Bosco	Hubbard	Saiki
Boulter	Hunter	Saxton
Brooks	Hutto	Schaefer
Brown (CO)	Hyde	Schuette
Buechner	Inhofe	Schulze
Bunning	Ireland	Shaw
Burton	Kasich	Shumway
Byron	Kolbe	Shuster
Callahan	Konnyu	Skeen
Carr	Kyl	Slaughter (NY)
Chapman	Lagomarsino	Slaughter (VA)
Cheney	Latta	Smith (IA)
Clinger	Leach (IA)	Smith (NE)
Coats	Leath (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Coble	Lent	Smith (TX)
Coleman (MO)	Lewis (CA)	Smith, Denny
Combest	Lewis (FL)	(OR)
Conte	Livingston	Smith, Robert
Courter	Lott	(NH)
Craig	Lowery (CA)	Snowe
Crane	Lujan	Solomon
Dannemeyer	Lungren	Spence
Daub	Mack	Stangeland
Davis (IL)	Madigan	Stenholm
DeLay	Marlenee	Stratton
DeWine	Martin (IL)	Stump
Dickinson	Martin (NY)	Sundquist
Dorman (CA)	McCandless	Sweeney
Dreier	McCollum	Swindall
Duncan	McCurdy	Synar
Dyson	McDade	Tallon
Early	McEwen	Tauke
Eckart	McGrath	Taylor
Edwards (OK)	McMillan (NC)	Thomas (CA)
Emerson	Meyers	Upton
English	Michel	Vander Jagt
Erdreich	Miller (OH)	Vucanovich
Fields	Molinari	Walker
Frenzel	Montgomery	Watkins
Gallely	Moorhead	Weber
Gallo	Murphy	Weldon
Gekas	Myers	Whittaker
Gilman	Nichols	Wolf
Gingrich	Nielson	Wortley
Goodling	Olin	Wylie
Gradison	Oxley	Young (AK)
Grandy	Parris	Young (FL)
Green	Pashayan	

#### NOES—230

Ackerman	Barnard	Bonker
Akaka	Bates	Borski
Alexander	Beilenson	Boucher
Anderson	Bennett	Boxer
Annunzio	Bereuter	Brennan
Anthony	Berman	Broomfield
Applegate	Biaggi	Brown (CA)
Aspin	Bilbray	Bruce
Atkins	Boehlert	Bryant
AuCoin	Boggs	Bustamante

Campbell	Huckaby	Penny
Cardin	Hughes	Perkins
Carper	Jacobs	Petri
Chandler	Jenkins	Pickett
Chappell	Johnson (CT)	Pickle
Clarke	Jones (NC)	Price (IL)
Clay	Jones (TN)	Price (NC)
Coelho	Jontz	Rangel
Coleman (TX)	Kanjorski	Richardson
Collins	Kaptur	Ridge
Conyers	Kastenmeier	Ritter
Cooper	Kennedy	Rodino
Coyne	Kennelly	Roe
Crockett	Kildee	Rose
Darden	Kleczka	Rostenkowski
Davis (MI)	Kolter	Roukema
de la Garza	Kostmayer	Rowland (CT)
DeFazio	LaFalce	Rowland (GA)
Dellums	Lancaster	Roybal
Derrick	Lantos	Russo
Dicks	Lehman (CA)	Sabo
Dingell	Lehman (FL)	Savage
DioGuardi	Leland	Sawyer
Dixon	Levin (MI)	Scheuer
Donnelly	Levine (CA)	Schneider
Dorgan (ND)	Lewis (GA)	Schroeder
Dowdy	Lightfoot	Sensenbrenner
Downey	Lipinski	Sharp
Durbin	Lloyd	Sikorski
Dwyer	Lowry (WA)	Sisisky
Edwards (CA)	Lukens, Thomas	Skaggs
Espy	MacKay	Skelton
Evans	Manton	Slattery
Fascell	Markey	Smith, Robert
Fawell	Martinez	(OR)
Fazio	Mavroules	Solarz
Fish	Mazzoli	Spratt
Florio	McCloskey	St Germain
Foley	McHugh	Staggers
Ford (MI)	McMillen (MD)	Stallings
Ford (TN)	Mfume	Stark
Frank	Mica	Stokes
Frost	Miller (CA)	Studds
Garcia	Miller (WA)	Swift
Gaydos	Mineta	Thomas (GA)
Gejdenson	Moakley	Torres
Gibbons	Mollohan	Torricelli
Glickman	Moody	Towns
Gonzalez	Morella	Trafiacant
Gordon	Morrison (CT)	Traxler
Grant	Morrison (WA)	Udall
Gray (IL)	Mrazek	Valentine
Gray (PA)	Murtha	Vento
Guarini	Nagle	Visclosky
Gunderson	Natcher	Volkmer
Hall (OH)	Neal	Walgren
Hamilton	Nelson	Waxman
Hatcher	Nowak	Weiss
Hawkins	Oakar	Wheat
Hayes (IL)	Oberstar	Whitten
Hayes (LA)	Obeys	Williams
Hefner	Ortiz	Wilson
Hertel	Owens (NY)	Wise
Hochbrueckner	Owens (UT)	Wolpe
Horton	Panetta	Wyden
Howard	Pease	Yates
Hoyer	Pelosi	Yatron

#### NOT VOTING—23

Badham	Flippo	Packard
Boner (TN)	Foglietta	Pepper
Bonior (MI)	Gephardt	Ray
Coughlin	Jeffords	Roemer
Daniel	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Dymally	Kemp	Smith (FL)
Feighan	Lukens, Donald	Tauzin
Flake	Matsui	

□ 1900

Mr. **YATRON** changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. **PACKWOOD**. I was unable to vote during the session. Had I been present, I would have voted no.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore** (Mr. **COELHO**). The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 55, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 192. TREATMENT OF CUBAN POLITICAL PRISONERS.

(b) **REFUGEE POLICY.**—The Department of State shall take steps as may be necessary to ensure that applications of Cuban political prisoners and their families for refugee status will be processed without regard to the duration of their imprisonment. Former political prisoners living in third countries will also be entitled to have their applications processed according to this refugee policy.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section—

(1) The term "Process means the acceptance and review of applications and the preparation of necessary documents and the making of appropriate determinations with respect to such applications.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 55, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. 192. HUMAN RIGHTS IN ETHIOPIA AND PARAGUAY.

(a) **FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO PARAGUAY.**—The Congress finds that—

(1) the police authorities in Paraguay regularly arrest and hold individuals in an arbitrary manner;

(2) the state of siege provision of the Constitution of Paraguay provides for the detention of individuals for an indefinite period of time without trial; and

(3) there are credible charges that police authorities have tortured and physically abused prisoners.

(b) **FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO ETHIOPIA.**—The Congress finds even more deplorable human rights abuses in Ethiopia, including the following:

(1) The Government of Ethiopia exercises absolute power over the majority of Ethiopians.

(2) Ethiopians have no civil or political freedoms and no institutions or laws to protect their human rights.

(3) Reliable reports that approximately 60 political prisoners in Ethiopia were executed in October 1985 without benefit of a trial.

(4) Over 1,000,000 Ethiopians have fled the country.

(c) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—The Congress expresses its outrage at the human rights abuses specified in subsections (a) and (b) and pledges to continually speak out against governments, such as the governments of Paraguay and Ethiopia, which torture and maim human beings.

Ms. **SNOWE** (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the **RECORD**.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.



□ 1915

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. COELHO). The Clerk will report the last amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 70, after line 16, add the following:

**TITLE VII—TREATY OF MUTUAL COOPERATION AND SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN**

**SEC. 701. UNITED STATES EXPENDITURES IN CARRYING OUT THE TREATY OF MUTUAL COOPERATION AND SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that—

(1) Japan has prospered greatly under the security provided by the United States, rising from devastation to an economic superpower with the third largest gross national product in the world;

(2) the security of Asia and the free world is critical to the continued prosperity of Japan;

(3) Japan contributes proportionately less to defense than any other major industrialized nation;

(4) Japan is limited to how much it can increase its own defense program by political, and psychological constraints;

(5) Japan enjoys a \$58,600,000,000 balance of trade surplus in the United States;

(6) the United States taxpayer cannot be expected to indefinitely shoulder a disproportionate share of the burden of defending Japan and the free world;

(7) the current inequitable financial commitment by Japan to its defense and that of the free world threatens to undermine its relations with the United States;

(8) continued good relations between the United States and Japan are mutually beneficial and critical to the security and economic well-being of the free world;

(9) it would be unwise for Japan to dramatically increase the level of its own defense forces to meet modern security needs, and commitments; and

(10) the people of Japan would undoubtedly welcome the opportunity to pay a fair share for the defense of their country.

(b) **JAPANESE DEFENSE SPENDING.**—Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall seek to enter into negotiations with the Government of Japan for the purpose of increasing the amount spent in any year by the Government of Japan for defense to at least 3 percent of the gross national product of Japan for that year.

Strike out the final period of subsection (b) and insert in lieu thereof: “, or of obtaining payment by Japan to the United States of the amount by which such percentage amount exceeds the amount spent by Japan for defense in such year.”.

Ms. SNOWE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the **RECORD**.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the committee amend-

ment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

**MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR.**

**SOLOMON**

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SOLOMON moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1777, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The motion to recommit was rejected.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

**RECORDED VOTE**

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 303, noes 111, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

**AYES—303**

Ackerman	Brown (CA)	Dorgan (ND)
Akaka	Bruce	Dornan (CA)
Alexander	Bryant	Dowdy
Anderson	Buechner	Downey
Andrews	Bunning	Duncan
Annunzio	Bustamante	Durbin
Anthony	Byron	Dwyer
Armey	Campbell	Early
Aspin	Cardin	Eckart
Atkins	Carper	Edwards (CA)
Ballenger	Chandler	Edwards (OK)
Barnard	Chapman	Erdreich
Bartlett	Chappell	Espy
Barton	Cheney	Fascell
Bateman	Clarke	Fawell
Bates	Clinger	Fazio
Beilenson	Coats	Feighan
Bennett	Coelho	Fish
Bentley	Coleman (MO)	Flippo
Bereuter	Coleman (TX)	Florio
Berman	Conte	Foley
Bevill	Cooper	Ford (MI)
Blaggi	Coyne	Frost
Billbray	Craig	Galleghy
Billakis	Dannemeyer	Garcia
Boehlert	Darden	Gaydos
Boggs	Davis (MI)	Gejdenson
Boland	de la Garza	Gekas
Bonker	DeFazio	Gibbons
Borski	Derrick	Gilman
Bosco	DeWine	Gingrich
Boucher	Dicks	Glickman
Boulter	Dingell	Goodling
Brennan	DioGuardi	Gordon
Brooks	Dixon	Gradison
Broomfield	Donnelly	Grandy

Grant	Martin (IL)	Roukema
Gray (IL)	Martinez	Rowland (GA)
Green	Matsui	Roybal
Guarini	Mavroules	Sabo
Gunderson	Mazzoli	Saiki
Hall (OH)	McCloskey	Sawyer
Hamilton	McCollum	Scheuer
Hammerschmidt	McCurdy	Schneider
Harris	McDade	Sharp
Hatcher	McEwen	Shaw
Hawkins	McGrath	Sikorski
Hayes (LA)	McHugh	Sisisky
Hefley	McMillan (NC)	Skaggs
Hefner	McMillen (MD)	Skeen
Hiler	Meyers	Skelton
Hochbrueckner	Mfume	Slaterry
Hopkins	Mica	Slaughter (NY)
Horton	Michel	Slaughter (VA)
Houghton	Miller (OH)	Smith (IA)
Howard	Miller (WA)	Smith (NJ)
Hoyer	Mineta	Smith (TX)
Hubbard	Moakley	Snowe
Huckaby	Mollohan	Solarz
Hughes	Montgomery	Spence
Hunter	Moody	Spratt
Hutto	Morella	St Germain
Jenkins	Morrison (WA)	Staggers
Johnson (CT)	Mrazek	Stratton
Johnson (SD)	Murtha	Studds
Jones (NC)	Myers	Stump
Kaptur	Nagle	Sundquist
Kasich	Natcher	Swift
Kennedy	Neal	Swindall
Kennelly	Nelson	Synar
Kildee	Nichols	Tallon
Kleczka	Nowak	Tauke
Kolbe	Oakar	Taylor
Kolter	Oberstar	Thomas (CA)
Kostmayer	Obey	Thomas (GA)
Kyl	Ortiz	Torres
LaFalce	Owens (UT)	Torricelli
Lagomarsino	Parris	Traffant
Lancaster	Patterson	Traxler
Lantos	Pease	Upton
Leach (IA)	Penny	Valentine
Leath (TX)	Pepper	Vander Jagt
Lehman (CA)	Perkins	Vento
Lehman (FL)	Pickett	Visclosky
Lent	Pickle	Volkmer
Levine (CA)	Porter	Walgren
Lewis (CA)	Price (IL)	Walker
Lewis (FL)	Price (NC)	Waxman
Lightfoot	Pursell	Weiss
Lipinski	Rahall	Wheat
Livingston	Ravenel	Whitten
Lott	Regula	Williams
Lowery (CA)	Rhodes	Wilson
Lowry (WA)	Richardson	Wise
Lujan	Ridge	Wolf
Luken, Thomas	Ritter	Wolpe
Lungren	Rodino	Wortley
Mack	Roe	Wylie
MacKay	Rogers	Yates
Madigan	Rose	Yatron
Manton	Rostenkowski	Young (AK)

**NOES—111**

Applegate	Evans	Lewis (GA)
Archer	Fields	Lloyd
AuCoin	Ford (TN)	Markey
Baker	Frank	Marlenee
Bliley	Frenzel	Martin (NY)
Boxer	Gallo	McCandless
Brown (CO)	Gonzalez	Miller (CA)
Burton	Gray (PA)	Molinari
Callahan	Gregg	Moorhead
Carr	Hall (TX)	Morrison (CT)
Clay	Hansen	Murphy
Coble	Hastert	Nielson
Collins	Hayes (IL)	Olin
Combust	Henry	Owens (NY)
Conyers	Herger	Oxley
Coughlin	Hertel	Panetta
Courter	Holloway	Pashayan
Crane	Hyde	Pelosi
Crockett	Inhofe	Petri
Daub	Ireland	Quillen
Davis (IL)	Jacobs	Rangel
DeLay	Jones (TN)	Rinaldo
Dellums	Jontz	Roberts
Dickinson	Kanjorski	Robinson
Dreier	Kastenmeier	Roth
Dyson	Konnyu	Rowland (CT)
Emerson	Latta	Russo
English	Leland	Savage

Saxton	Smith, Robert	Sweeney
Schaefer	(NH)	Towns
Schroeder	Smith, Robert	Vucanovich
Schuette	(OR)	Watkins
Schulze	Solomon	Weber
Sensenbrenner	Stallings	Weldon
Shumway	Stangeland	Whittaker
Shuster	Stark	Wyden
Smith (NE)	Stenholm	Young (FL)
Smith, Denny	Stokes	
(OR)		

## NOT VOTING—19

Badham	Gephardt	Roemer
Boner (TN)	Jeffords	Schumer
Bonior (MI)	Kemp	Smith (FL)
Daniel	Levin (MI)	Tauzin
Dymally	Lukens, Donald	Udall
Flake	Packard	
Foglietta	Ray	

□ 1930

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Bonior of Michigan for, with Mr. Dymally against.

Mr. BUECHNER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1988 and 1989 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Voice of America, the Board for International Broadcasting, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 1777.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1777, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1988 AND 1989

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1777, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, cross references, and grammatical and spelling errors, to make conforming changes to the table of contents, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### THE COURAGE OF HAZRAT KHAN, 12-YEAR-OLD AFGHAN WOUNDED IN SOVIET BOMBING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I think some of my colleagues know I have taken several opportunities here in the well of the House to talk about the plight of the people of Afghanistan, who for the last 7½ years have been suffering a genocide imposed on them by the Soviet Union. Before 1979, 15½ million Afghans lived in that wonderful country. Since that time, nearly 2 million have been killed. The largest refugee population in the world is in Pakistan and Iran. Over 5 million Afghans have been forced to seek refuge in those two countries and an additional 2 million people have been forced from their homes within the country.

Since 1979, nearly half the population of Afghanistan has been impacted by this horrible encroachment by the Soviet Union into their country.

This past weekend I had a wonderful opportunity to spend some time with a very brave and courageous young Afghan. He is 12 years old. His name is Hazrat Khan. He came to visit us in California, had an opportunity to go to Disneyland, spoke to a number of groups, and just yesterday in Los Angeles we held a news conference, then got on an airplane and flew to Sacramento, CA, where he had the very rare opportunity to address the California State Senate. Just this morning he addressed the California State Assembly telling them about his crisis.

A little over 2 years ago, Hazrat was in his home getting ready to walk to visit a friend and all of a sudden four Soviet MI-24 HIND-D helicopters descended on his village. The wall of his family's home collapsed on his legs. His mother was killed. It took him 1 week on horseback, his uncle helped him get across the border into Pakistan and he has been in this country on a medical visa.

I am happy to say that within the last few months he has been able to get out of his wheelchair and he is walking on crutches.

Yesterday morning at the Los Angeles Press Club Hazrat and I read a letter, which I would like to share with my colleagues. That letter is addressed to General Secretary Gorbachev, and it reads as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 22, 1987.

His Excellency MIKHAIL GORBACHEV,  
General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Moscow, RSFSR, U.S.S.R.

DEAR MR. GENERAL SECRETARY: I have recently become acquainted with Hazrat Khan, a 12-year-old Afghan who was wounded when Soviet airplanes bombed his village. Hazrat was paralyzed when the wall of his home collapsed on his legs. During the bombing, his mother was killed. An American private voluntary organization brought Hazrat to the United States. For the last two years, Hazrat has undergone surgery to correct his injuries. You will be pleased to know, he can now walk with the help of crutches.

As you well know, your new policies of "openness" in the Soviet Union have created a great amount of speculation among the western democracies. I and my other colleagues in the United States Congress genuinely hope that you are sincere about reforming Soviet society. The Soviet people and their leadership would be well served by a restoration of democracy to your system. Consequently, so would world peace be well served if we can believe your statements.

It is with great sadness then that I must turn your attention from your public pronouncements of goodwill to the presence of Soviet troops and killing in Afghanistan. You say you are a man of peace who represents a country which is too well familiar with the horrors of war, so I must ask how you can allow the Soviet war in Afghanistan to continue? After seven and a half years of fighting, how can you pretend that the Soviet presence in Afghanistan is welcome?

Hazrat has told me that his mother is only one of over a million Afghans killed by Soviet troops since 1979. Just as President Reagan asked you to demonstrate your good intentions by destroying the Berlin Wall, I ask you to withdraw your troops from Afghanistan. Hazrat has also signed this letter in an appeal to you to return his mother country to peace.

Sincerely,

DAVID DREIER,  
Member of Congress.  
HAZRAT KHAN,  
Afghan.

□ 1945

I am not expecting a response to that letter, but I do believe that it is important for the American people to be aware of the fact that genocide is being committed by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan in their century-and-a-half quest for the free world's oil supply, the Persian Gulf.

We must do everything that we can to help these brave and courageous people who are simply seeking the same kind of religious freedom which we as Americans enjoy.

#### LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING COINS FOR 1988 OLYMPICS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation authorizing the minting of



gold and silver commemorative coins next year in commemoration of the participation of American athletes in the 1988 winter and summer Olympic Games. Not only will these coins commemorate American participation, but they will also help raise badly needed funds for the training of our athletes.

Even today, across America thousands of athletes are training hard with a goal of being named to the 1988 U.S. Olympic teams. Many of these athletes are making tremendous personal sacrifices in the hope of being able to represent their country in the contests at the pinnacle of sport. They are putting in thousands of hours of arduous and often lonely practice with the goal of being able to stand on the victory platform with a gold medal on their chests, while the American flag is raised, and our national anthem is played and millions look on around the world.

In 1982, Congress authorized the minting of commemorative coins for the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic games. The sale of those coins raised \$73.5 million for the U.S. Olympic Committee [USOC] and the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee [LAOOC]. That money made it possible for the U.S. Olympic Committee in 1984 to distribute \$6.4 million to the national governing bodies, which are the amateur sports organizations responsible for governing the conduct and promotion of particular amateur sports. That amount represented two-thirds of the amount the USOC gave to the national governing bodies in 1984. This money played no small role in enabling U.S. athletes to win more medals at the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics than any country ever won at a single Olympics.

In addition, the USOC used \$31.7 million in coin money to help fund the U.S. Olympic Foundation, which it founded in 1984 to foster U.S. participation in national and international amateur sports competitions through the support of amateur sports organizations in this country. Another \$10.8 million in coin money originally paid to the LAOOC was also paid into the Foundation.

The Olympic coin money has been a tremendous boost to the USOC, but costs for U.S. participation in the games continue to rise at a rapid rate. This new coin program will help raise millions of badly needed dollars so that American athletes can have the types of training facilities necessary for them to fully realize their potential and perform at the peak of their abilities at the games.

The legislation authorizes the minting of 1 million gold coins and 10 million silver coins. The coins will be sold directly by the U.S. Mint to the public and will carry a surcharge that will be paid to the U.S. Olympic Committee solely to train U.S. Olympic athletes, to support local or community amateur athletic programs and to erect facilities for the training of such athletes. In addition, the legislation requires that the coins be sold at no net cost to the U.S. Government.

I am pleased to be the sponsor of this legislation. I hope my colleagues will join me in co-sponsoring it as a means of supporting our U.S. Olympic athletes.

## DON'T BLAME THE PRESIDENT FOR OUR BUDGET FAILURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Hutto). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I take the time this evening to reflect on the debate that took place earlier today on the budget resolution. What I have in my hand is a pamphlet that is put out by the National Taxpayers Union, and it rates the voting of each individual Member in the House according to how they vote on various spending bills.

I mention the National Taxpayers Union because it is not a partisan report, it is not a partisan organization, and as a matter of fact there was input to these scores, input from Members of the House on both parties. Again, what I am trying to lay out here is that I think that the National Taxpayers Union is close to a fair analysis of both Democrats and Republicans when it comes to spending, and when I say spending, I do not mean just spending on the domestic side, I am also referring to spending on the defense side.

The reason that I am motivated to take a couple of moments to speak about this is because during the debate and for the last several months the attempt has been made by the Democratic Party to imply—it has been much stronger than that—they claim that the reason for the deficits that the country is experiencing comes because of the President's failure to become involved in the debate.

I would say, and I think that most Americans understand, that there is not a dollar spent that is not appropriated by this House, that is not voted on in this House.

While the debate was going on, I took note of each individual Member who came down to the floor of the House to discuss the budget resolution. I have listed each of the Members of the Democratic Party who came down and talked about the budget resolution. Again, what they tried to do was to shift the blame from themselves to the President. Again, not one dollar is spent in this country unless it is appropriated by this House.

Without naming the individuals—and let me just stop at this point and say that what you ought to do if you are concerned—and I guess that is another point—if your concern is that we are spending too much money or that we have raised too many tax dollars on the American worker, if that is your concern, then I would say that you want to look at the National Taxpayers Union guide that rates the Congress.

If you feel that more spending is needed, if you feel that all of the different programs in the \$1 trillion

budget that we now have are programs that should not be touched, then you do not want to look at this, because in essence what you are saying is that you are willing to have the taxes, whether it is in your business or whether on you individually, you are willing to have those taxes increase. That is fine. Then you are not really interested in this discussion.

Now let me get to the point. There were 13 different Members of the Democratic Party who came down and said that we ought to pass the budget resolution that is going to increase taxes, increase social spending, and reduce defense to some degree. All 13 of those spoke in favor of this higher spending program and the higher tax program, and a portion of them said that the deficit that we have is because the President of the United States would not control spending. It is up to the Congress to control spending.

I have one other thing: What is a good score, and what is a bad score? According to the congressional spending scores as outlined by the National Taxpayers Union, if you had a 28 percent or 28 or below, then you were considered by the National Taxpayers Union as being a big spender—that is, if you had a 28 or below.

I am just going to read down the numbers of the speakers that came out here on the Democratic side: 26 was the first score, 25 was the second score, 27 was the third score, 21 was the fourth score, 21 was the fifth score, 28 was the sixth score, and on, 47, 27, 24, 31, 32, 35, 24; an average of 28.

It is no wonder that those Members would come to the floor of the House and try to shift the blame to the President of the United States when they in fact failed.

## WHAT IF? THE WORST-CASE SCENARIO IN THE PERSIAN GULF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday I spoke to the House about the real dangers of the proposal to reflag Kuwaiti oil tankers—the threat of Iranian terrorism, mines or other bloodletting that would not leave any Persian fingerprints in the blood.

Today I would like to continue this series of speeches on the Persian Gulf by talking about another danger—the worst case scenario.

It's easy to imagine what the worst case is. It's simply that we get sucked into the maelstrom of the Iran-Iraq war and end up as a participant rather than an innocent bystander. It may be a little harder, however, to conceive of how we would be sucked into that war. Let me outline just how that could come about.

But to begin we need a little background to understand how the worst could occur.

First, one must understand that there are two facets to the Iran-Iraq war—the ground war and the tanker war.

In the ground war, the Iranians are on top. They are not winning in the sense that they have the Iraqis on the ropes. But they do have the Iraqis on the defensive—and Baghdad has no way of changing that because it is unwilling to risk the huge number of casualties that would result if it went onto the offensive—an offensive that might take thousands of square miles of Iranian territory, but which still would not have any assurance of knocking Iran out of the war.

In the tanker war, on the other hand, it is Iraq that is on top and has Iran on the defensive. The point of the tanker war is economic—pure and simple. Iran depends on oil exports for 95 percent of its foreign exchange earnings. And 100 percent of its oil exports must go by tanker through the Persian Gulf. If Iraq can shut down all or most of Tehran's oil exports, it can shut down Iran's economy and make it impossible for Iran to sustain the war effort indefinitely.

Curiously, Baghdad has not pressed its tanker blitz to that conclusion. For years, its Soviet-trained pilots made only sporadic strikes at Kharg Island, the terminal for 90 percent of Iran's oil exports. They would fly at altitudes measured in miles rather than feet and make ineffective strikes. Then, about 2 years ago, pilots trained in France began graduating and returning home to pilot newly bought Mirage F-1 jets. They were a different breed. Last summer Baghdad began a concerted campaign against tankers, against Kharg and against the temporary loading terminals that Iran tried to paste together when Kharg started taking a serious battering.

Iran suffered a dramatic production drop. From an average of almost 2.3 million barrels a day in the first half of 1986, Iranian oil production fell to an average of 1.3 million barrels a day last August, September and October. Since Iran consumes from 600,000 to 700,000 barrels a day of its own production, that meant Iranian oil exports—and, hence, Iranian foreign exchange earnings—were more than halved. Exports dropped from about 1.6 million barrels a day to about 0.6 million. That was all as a result of the intense Iraqi air campaign.

But that campaign ended. In November, Iranian production rose again, and it has now returned to 2.3 million barrels a day.

Why did Baghdad halt what was a very successful air campaign? No one knows for certain. But there is a strong suspicion that Baghdad's allies along the south shore of the Persian Gulf greatly feared one thing: that an Iran battered badly by Iraq's economic offensive would strike harshly at the handiest—and weakest—targets, which are Baghdad's allies along the south shore of the Persian Gulf.

The only realistic way for Baghdad to bring this war to an end on anything approaching satisfactory conditions for itself is to cut Iran's oily umbilical cord.

Tehran's response has been to vocalize one fundamental foreign policy repeatedly: The Persian Gulf and the Strait of Hormuz will be open and available to all—or to none. In

other words: If you allow our throat to be cut, we will cut your throat.

Baghdad will be free to prosecute the air war to a successful conclusion only if the Arab States of the Persian Gulf don't have to worry about an interruption of their commerce.

That could happen if Arab shipping in the gulf were, for example, protected by the superpowers. If, say, the United States or the Soviet Union were to protect all that shipping, the Arab States might no longer feel a need to restrain Baghdad and Baghdad would feel free to push the air attacks on Kharg Island and Iranian shipping to a crisis point.

At that point, who knows what would happen. All bets are off about Iranian rationality. It could sue for peace. It could strike out against us in the Persian Gulf. It could suffer another revolution promoted by economic chaos. From Baghdad's position, none of those outcomes is bad. From our standpoint, one of those outcomes is obviously very bad.

So, the worst case scenario of our involvement in the Persian Gulf reflagging is that we serve as a shield for the Gulf States behind which the Iraqis are free to fight the war they can win—and that, as a result, Iran is pushed to the wall and responds by striking out at us repeatedly, dragging us into the war.

This "shield" scenario is a possible outcome, though by no means a certain outcome. But American policymakers need to think through the foreign policy chess match to logical conclusions and not just play it one move at a time, which is a prescription for being on the receiving end of a checkmate. Incidentally, the analogy is appropriate: checkmate is generally believed to be a corruption of a Persian term, "Shah mord," meaning, "The king is dead." The Iraqis would certainly love to checkmate us.

Now, let me emphasize that there is more than one way for the chess match to play out.

The "shield" gambit doesn't necessarily come into play if we protect only 11 of the tankers plying the Gulf. Tehran can still strike at many other vessels—Panamanian, Greek, Cypriot, et cetera—that call at Kuwaiti oil terminals. Tehran is also free to hit ships of many flags that call at the ports in the other Arab States along the Persian Gulf.

However, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger spoke to a news conference and later to the House Armed Services Committee about the possibility of protecting all neutral shipping in the Persian Gulf, which indicates that the administration failed to work through all the moves in the chess games before it approved the reflagging plan. I have also been told that the administration spoke to Kuwait and offered to protect all Kuwaiti shipping. It was the Kuwaitis who said they were only interested in reflagging 11 of their 22 tankers.

After considerable confusion and toing-and-froing, the administration finally appears to have recognized the "shield" problem. The very first sentence of last week's Defense Department report to Congress on Security Arrangements in the Persian Gulf addresses that issue:

Protecting 11 Kuwaiti ships under the U.S. flag is not part of an open-ended unilateral American commitment to defend all nonbelligerent shipping in the Persian Gulf.

The fact that this is the opening sentence of a 35-page report indicates the importance the administration now realizes it must attach to limiting this program. It also shows how the administration trapped itself in its own rhetoric.

Officially, the administration argues that the reflagging is part of an effort to (a) guarantee freedom of navigation in the Persian Gulf and (b) protect the flow of oil. Guarding 11 of the hundreds of vessels that ply the waters of the Persian Gulf helps those 11 tankers but does very little for the grander concepts of guaranteeing freedom of navigation and protecting the flow of oil. Those two arguments drive one logically to a policy of providing protection for all neutral shipping in the Persian Gulf—which is how Secretary Weinberger found himself offering total protection, which in turn meant providing a shield behind which Iraq could beat Iran into submission.

By changing tune, as the administration has now done, we avoid becoming a de facto ally of Baghdad by providing that military shield.

But the fact that the administration had to change its tune also indicates that the administration had not thought through its policy before it started enunciating it. Mind you, this is not a case where time pressures forced an administration to patch together a policy in days. The administration's own chronology shows that Kuwait formally informed the U.S. Embassy in Kuwait of its interest in reflagging on December 23, 1986. Two months later, in the first week of March, the President approved an interagency recommendation to protect the Kuwaiti tankers. Three months later, Secretary Weinberger was speaking of protecting all neutral shipping in the gulf.

So, the policy is not to confine all escort service to 11 Kuwaiti tankers reflagged American. What happens next? As I noted in the first speech in this series last Wednesday, the likelihood of a direct Iranian attack on a ship flying the American flag is remote.

One thing the Iraqis might do—might be doing—is to drop mines in channels plied by U.S. flag vessels. Since May 17, four ships have struck mines. All have been in the channel leading to Kuwait's main oil terminal, Mina al-Ahmadi, where our escort will have ended. This raises the prospect that we will safely escort a ship for 600 miles, wave it goodbye, turn around and sail off, only to hear a loud boom behind us. We would look rather silly. This highlights two points:

First, we must consider not only the possibility of loss of life, but also of getting egg all over our face, and

Second, the Government of Kuwait has a definite role here in providing, at absolute minimum, protection for shipping in its territorial waters. Kuwait is perfectly capable of doing that; it has four dozen patrol craft in its navy plus six fast attack missile boats carrying—of all things—Exocet missiles. One of these 255-ton ships bears the unfortunate name *Al-Boom*.

Mining—or dropping the occasional mine in a shipping channel—is one tactic the Iraqis may already be pursuing. A second possibility is that they will simply attack ships flying flags other than the stars and stripes. Eleven tankers will be safe but hundreds of others will be



subject to attack—and may, in fact, have suddenly become more inviting targets. What do we do if all around the gulf other shipping is being attacked by the Iranians. The opinion will quickly evolve that our reflagging of Kuwaiti vessels has made the gulf much less safe for all but 11 ships.

What do we do? Has the administration thought through this chess gambit? Are we going to ignore this development? If we really believe in freedom of navigation and the free flow of oil, don't we have to do something to help out the other countries, four of which—all but Saudi Arabia—are even smaller in population than Kuwait? If we do help, we risk building a shield for Iraq incrementally. If we don't act, we look a bit silly guarding 11 tankers while others burn around us.

In sum, the administration didn't really think through this reflagging policy before adopting it. It leaped before it looked. The remarks of the Defense Secretary reflect a failure to understand the implications of providing a shield for Baghdad's war on Iranian tankers. And there is no indication that the administration has thought through what it will do if Iran responds in a very logical fashion by turning its guns on ships other than the protected 11.

#### COMMUNIST POLITICAL WARFARE AND HELPING COMMUNIST DICTATORSHIPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss briefly Communist political warfare and helping Communist dictatorships.

We had a vote on the House floor today in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] offered an amendment which would have blocked travel to Communist Nicaragua, and as amended by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] it specifically blocked travel for those people who wanted to go to Nicaragua to help the Communist dictatorship militarily.

In other words, under this amendment, which passed by 213 to 201, it is not appropriate for Americans to go to Nicaragua to help the Communist dictatorship militarily.

A number of my colleagues asked why this mattered, and I want to take just a moment or two to talk about this amendment.

First of all, I would recommend to every American looking at a book called, "The Real Secret War: Sandinistas Political Warfare and its Effects on Congress" by Francis Bouchey, Michael Waller, and Steve Baldwin. That book indicates clearly that there is a systematic Soviet, Cuban, and Nicaraguan Communist effort to influence the American Congress to influence American politics and to frame the debate.

Second, I would say to my friends, we are engaged in a long struggle with the Soviet empire. The Soviet empire

is the active enemy of freedom and the active enemy of America. Sometimes we engaged in that struggle openly, as we were in the Korean war and in Vietnam. Sometimes we are engaged in that struggle covertly, as we are to some extent in Afghanistan, probably the most open covert war in modern history. Sometimes it helps our side to have an American embassy in the country, as it does in Nicaragua, and other times it is better to break diplomatic relations.

There is a systematic, thorough, Soviet KGB, Cuban, Nicaraguan Communist effort to establish Soviet Communist colonies in Central America.

In "The Real Secret War" by Bouchey et al., they indicate clearly, for example, the degree to which the Soviet Union directs the Cuban secret police. In other documents which we have captured, we know, for example, that Cuban and Nicaraguan diplomats in the United Nations systematically try to manipulate American politics and the American news media.

All that we were saying in today's vote was that the United States should establish a policy that like Lafayette, whose picture is in this Chamber, we help freedom, we help the forces of freedom, we are opposed to communism, we oppose the forces of communism. In particular, as a first step in this long march toward a free world, we are not willing to allow well-meaning but misguided Americans on the left to go to a country to put on a uniform to carry a weapon; that it should be against the law for Americans to get a passport to go to help a Communist dictatorship.

□ 1955

Tragically, two of the potential Presidential candidates voted against that amendment, two of them Democrats who are running for President, one announced, one exploring, decided to vote to allow Americans to go to Nicaragua to fight for a Communist dictatorship on the side of communism.

I would suggest that is not an issue of freedom of speech, it is not an issue of right of travel, it is a fundamental question of whether should some day American troops go into Nicaragua, as they went into Grenada, as they might have gone into Iran when our hostages were held, what would happen then to that young American who foolishly had put on a Nicaraguan uniform, what would the relationship be then of those young, well-meaning Americans who had been blinded into being pro-Communist, who were standing there with a Soviet AK-47, and then what would this Congress say, whose side would this Congress be on, the young American in an American uniform doing what an American President asked him, or the young American in a Communist uniform carrying Soviet weapons? It is madness for us

engaged in a long-term war with the Soviet empire, for us trying to preserve freedom across the planet, for us trying to slowly and systematically help people be free, it is madness for us to allow some of our children to be convinced they should carry Soviet weapons, work with Soviet advisers, create Soviet dominated dictatorships, and this is a first step today by a narrow margin of 213 to 201 saying once again what John F. Kennedy knew, what Harry Truman knew, what Hubert Humphrey knew, that a healthy America knows who the friends of freedom are and who the Communists are and it sides with freedom.

#### NO CONTRA AID VOTE UNTIL SELECT COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTTO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution which amends the rules of the house to provide that the House will not consider any measure providing further aid to the Contras until the reports of both of the select committees investigating the Iran-Contra affair have been filed with the House and Senate.

On January 7, 1987, by an overwhelming vote of 416 to 2, the House adopted House Resolution 12, creating the Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions with Iran. The previous day, by another overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 88 to 4, the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 23, creating the Select Committee on Secret Military Assistance to Iran and the Nicaraguan Opposition.

These committees were charged with important responsibilities. Although their chief function is to investigate those responsible for illegally selling arms to Iran and providing unauthorized covert aid to the Contras, the committees were also specifically requested to review the international policy objectives of the United States and to make recommendations on legislative actions necessary or proper to reduce the harm to U.S. policy that has been caused by the Iran-Contra affair.

The resolution which I am introducing today simply postpones any consideration in the House of further aid to the Contras until we have the benefit of the views of those committees as to the impact of the Iran-Contra affair on U.S. policy objectives and on what should be done to mitigate the harm done by that affair. The resolution does not prohibit further aid to the Contras or, indeed, pre-judge the findings of those committees in any way. It simply asks that we wait for the final verdict before entrusting further dollars and the public trust to those same officials and policies.

Holding off a vote on Contra aid until the reports of the select committees are filed would not impose a great delay. The President is not expected to file his request for further aid to the Contras before August or September. The House select committee is scheduled to file

its report by October 30, 1987; the Senate select committee, which is currently scheduled to file its report by August 1, 1987, will probably extend its deadline to the House date. If the resolution which I am introducing today is adopted, the House vote would be delayed only briefly.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there will be some who will say there is no connection between the Iran-Contra scandal and future policy. But that is not true. From what we know so far, it is clear that some senior administration officials who are still centrally involved in promulgating and justifying our policy toward Central America apparently lied to Congress or tolerated lies by other officials, in order to safeguard their policy objectives. We must know whether they lied to Congress before we can judge the validity of their calls for further aid to the Contras. We must know whether these are, indeed, individuals who would say anything to Congress, without regard for the truth, to get more aid to the Contras. We must have that information before we vote on another aid request.

The other basis for this proposal, Mr. Speaker, is that we need to regain some control of the process under which we consider Contra-aid proposals. Assuming the expedited procedures for consideration of Contra aid are retained, we will have to make a decision on Contra aid under a timetable determined by the administration and one which presumably will be favorable to the administration. The formal request for aid may be timed to require a vote before the Iran-Contra reports are filed or to coincide with a summit meeting or some other major event. We cannot control completely the impact of outside events on our votes. But we can, and should, control the impact of events inside Congress on our votes. The single most significant event inside Congress, with a direct bearing on a vote on aid to the Contras, is the completion of the work of the select committees.

I think it is clear, too, that the American people see a connection between the completion of the hearings and a vote on Contra aid. The American people are entitled to a full accounting of the policies and actions surrounding Contra aid before, not after, a vote on any request for more taxpayer dollars to support the same policies. There is little reason to hold such extensive hearings if Congress and the Nation cannot consider the lessons learned from this scandal in developing future policy.

The purpose of the Iran-Contra hearings has been not only to expose wrongdoing, but to come to a better understanding of those who engaged in these unlawful activities and of the processes which allowed these activities to occur. We should have the opportunity to reflect on that information before we decide how we will vote on further aid to the Contras.

The following is the text of the resolution.

#### H. RES. 208

Resolution to provide that it shall not be in order in the House to consider any measure providing assistance for the Nicaraguan democratic resistance until after the House and Senate Special Select Committees investigating the Iran-Contra matter have filed their final reports

*Resolved*, That notwithstanding any other Rule of the House, it shall not be in order to consider—

(1) any bill or resolution, any amendment (including an amendment of the Senate), or any conference report, which would provide for assistance for the Nicaraguan democratic resistance; or

(2) any report from the Committee on Rules on any rule or order of business waiving this resolution;

until after the House Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions With Iran and the Senate Select Committee on Secret Military Assistance to Iran and the Nicaraguan Opposition have reported the final results of their investigation and study to their respective Houses.

#### THE NATIONAL DIVIDEND PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas, [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, today the House adopted the first trillion dollar budget. In the past 6 years the Nation has dramatically declined from a strong creditor nation to one deeply in debt. The balance of trade account with trading nations is in deficit, the Federal budget is in deficit. The fiscal policies have failed. Different approaches must be tried. One interesting approach has been advanced by John Perry of Florida who proposes the National Dividend Plan. Mr. Perry is noted for his genius and moral approach to problems solving. Accordingly, I commend the proposal for consideration of this body.

#### RUNAWAY SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial issues that the 100th Congress will take up relates to accounting or establishing a sense of accountability for who is responsible for this runaway spending that the Federal Government has been pursuing mostly during the decade of the 1980's.

Today in the House during the debate on the budget resolution claims were made by both sides as to who is responsible, that is the Congress or the President, and it is on that subject that I have taken this special order this evening to talk about that issue and what the facts reveal.

Late last year I asked a member of my staff to prepare an analysis which would compare the requests of the Reagan administration for the 5 budget years that his administration is accountable for, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985,

and 1986, and then contrast what Congress has appropriated in response to those requests for each of those 5 fiscal years.

When we came back to Washington in January of this year I took the floor in a special order and announced what the results were, and there was some criticism raised at the time that the figures were not accurate. One could not have a consensus on them because different people talk different figures and so on.

So what I did was I sent the analysis that my office prepared to the CBO, Congressional Budget Office, and the OMB, Office of Management and Budget. I asked them to check over these figures and analyze whether they believed the statements or conclusions that my office developed were accurate.

It is the conclusion of the Congressional Budget Office that I want to share with Members at this time. My reason for selecting the Congressional Budget Office I think is obvious. In this, the 100th Congress, there is a Democrat majority in the House of Representatives, as there has been continuously for the past 34 years, and also there is a Democrat majority serving the U.S. Senate. The person that is heading the Congressional Budget Office was hired by the Democrat majority controlling Congress. I think anyone who works in this forum, in the Congress of the United States, must recognize that if there is a particular interpretation that will be favorable to the Democratic majority in the House and the Senate, the Congressional Budget Office will find a way to produce it because, after all, the head of the Congressional Budget Office was in fact hired by the Democrat majority in the House and the Senate.

What the comparison shows over that 5 years, 1982 through 1986, is from the analysis of the Congressional Budget Office critiquing of the figures that this Member from California presented to it in the manner that I have described. In four categories Congress appropriated less money than what this President asked for. This is over that 5-year span, 1982 through 1986. In national defense a total of \$65.4 billion less; Medicare, a total of \$8 billion less; Social Security, a total of \$5.3 billion less; net interest on the debt, a total of \$5.6 billion less. In those 4 categories, Congress appropriated a total of \$84.5 billion less than what this President asked to be spent.

However, in all other categories, Congress over those 5 years appropriated \$176.8 billion more than the President asked for, and the total is \$92.2 billion, that is \$92.2 billion is the sum that Congress appropriated beyond what this President asked be spent.



The reason that it is reduced from \$176.8 billion is that in the four categories that I described, national defense, Medicare, Social Security, net interest, \$84.5 billion less was appropriated. I do not think there can be any question what this shows clearly to the American people is that Congress is the institution that is accountable for this runaway spending. Those who serve here must respect that fact, and if the people of this country want to change the spending habits of the Congress of the United States they are going to have to change who shows up here in the organization of the 101st Congress, which will take place in January 1989.

Another question that comes up is how did we really develop this spending pattern that I have described where over these 5 years Congress has appropriated \$92.2 billion more than what this President asked be spent. To find a rationale for where this system really went out of kilter one has to go back to fiscal years 1982 and 1983 to really appreciate where this level of Federal spending got elevated beyond what it should be.

In the category of "Other," and I can enumerate for my colleagues what mostly fits within the category of "Other." It is what includes some entitlements and most discretionary programs, comprising the bulk of social program spending, the foundation of the liberal welfare state in America.

In the category of "Other" in 1982 the President asked that \$221.1 billion be spent and, in fact, according to the analysis of the Congressional Budget Office, we actually spent \$255.5 billion. Then in 1983 the President asked that \$195.1 billion be spent in that category, whereas in fact Congress appropriated some \$273 billion according to the figures of the Congressional Budget Office.

When we have increases in appropriations of the magnitude that I have just described, \$78 billion roughly more in 1983 and some \$34 billion more in 1982 just in this category called "Other," it does not take a great deal of analysis to come to the conclusion that because of Congress markedly increasing spending in these categories in fiscal years 1982 and 1983 we have elevated the entire level of Federal spending much beyond what this President ever asked be spent. In fact, I believe in those 2 years we have the origin of the reason, part of the reason, why the Federal budget deficit for fiscal year 1987, the current year, is about \$200 billion.

It is fair to say from these figures that had the budget requests of this President been honored, the total level of Federal spending would be about \$100 billion less than what it actually is today. In other words, about half of the total budget deficit that we will experience in fiscal year 1987 is caused

by excesses that Congress has appropriated in the areas that I have described.

When the President gave his State of the Union message at the beginning of this year in January, the President made a statement to the Nation as to what his spending priorities were and what would be contained in the budget proposal that he would later send to the Congress. In response to the President's request, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], speaking for the House of Representatives as Speaker, made a response, and Senate BYRD, speaking for the Democrats in the Senate, also gave a report to the Nation. Here is part of the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], the Speaker of the House, and I quote from a statement of January 31, 1987:

The President sometimes likes to criticize Congress for what he calls "big spending" but the plain truth is that for the 6 years of this administration Congress actually has appropriated less in total spending than Mr. Reagan has asked us to appropriate.

When Members hear that they say something does not fit. The President is claiming one thing, Mr. WRIGHT is claiming another. I do not claim that Mr. WRIGHT, the Speaker, would deliberately misrepresent any facts. I think he is just mistaken. He was mistaken when he told the American public that Congress has appropriated less than this President has asked be spent. In fact, as I indicated earlier in my comments, over this 5-year span the net amount that Congress has appropriated in excess of what this President asked be spent is \$92.2 billion.

This issue of accountability for this fiscal mess will be debated during the balance of the 100th Congress, for the balance of this year and also next year, because it is becoming apparent as each week unfolds that we are in deep fiscal trouble and monetary trouble with the problem of runaway spending and the lack of a will in Congress to bring it under control.

For example, in fiscal year 1986, in 1987, and 1988 we will add about two-thirds of a trillion dollars to the national debt of this country. To me, the true measure of the annual deficit is not what the statisticians in OMB or CBO or in the office of any of us project that it will be. The true measure of the Federal deficit is how much did we increase the national debt by.

In 1986, we actually increased the national debt by \$285 billion. In 1987, the projected increase in the national debt will total some \$208 billion, and in 1988 the projected increase in the national debt is some \$189 billion. As I have indicated, over that 3-year span we will have added some two-thirds of a trillion dollars to the national debt in this country.

I do not believe that anybody thinks that we can continue that course in-

definitely, and it is for this reason that I think we in Congress establish a factual basis for the people of this country as to who is accountable for this runaway spending.

□ 210

One of the arguments you hear from time to time is that "Well, we are in this fiscal mess because we are spending too much on defense." Any of the Members has an opportunity of looking at the "United States Budget in Brief." This one is for fiscal year 1988. On page 99, you have the tables that trace the course of Federal spending in constant dollars, adjusted for inflation over the period 1971-90. It is interesting to contrast defense spending across that span of time. Contrast defense spending in 1971 which was listed at \$202 billion and defense spending in 1987 of \$242 billion. Again, I will say this is in constant prices, fiscal year 1982.

So that we are comparing apples with apples across the span of time when inflation has worked its magic and the instability of our fiscal system.

Again, in 1971 for defense \$202 billion, 1987 \$242 billion adjusted for inflation in constant 1982 prices.

That amounts to about a 20-percent increase across that span of some 16 years. Contrast the increase in spending for individuals across that same span.

In 1971, \$181 billion; in 1987, \$392 billion, an increase of \$211 billion, again in constant dollars, an increase of over 110 percent.

To contrast, increase in defense spending across that 16 years is some 20 percent, increase in payments to individuals is 110 percent.

Then another category, including individuals, is nondefense spending. In 1971, we spent \$306 billion; in 1987 some \$619 billion for an increase of \$313 billion across that 16-year span or an increase of better than 100 percent.

The point I want to share with my colleagues is that we are in this fiscal mess not because we are spending too much money on defense but because we are spending too much on social programs.

I think the data that is described in that analysis clearly indicates what I have described.

Another argument that one hears from time to time in discussions is that "Well, the Reagan administration has cut the entitlement programs for expenditures for civil service retirement, military retirement, veterans' compensation and pensions, income security, unemployment assistance, Medicare, Medicaid," and so on and so forth.

Just the opposite has been the truth, as I have indicated. The Congress of the United States has been responsible for setting the spending

levels for these programs and they have been increased dramatically across the 5 budget years that I have related. In fact, in most of these categories that I have described, Congress has appropriated in excess of \$176 billion beyond what this President has asked to spend.

I took this special order this evening because I think it is important for

Members of Congress, Members of the House of Representatives to know what the facts are with respect to who is accountable for this runaway spending.

I sent out a notice of this "dear colleague" in hopes some of my Democratic friends would be here on the floor so that we would have an opportunity of debating this issue. Unfortu-

nately, I do not see any of them in the Chamber at this time so that we would have a chance to discuss these facts in the event that they would choose to do so. I hope I will have an opportunity to do so in the future.

The chart referred to is as follows:

# WHERE THE MONEY WENT III—THE REAGAN BUDGETS VERSUS ACTUAL SPENDING

(Outlays in billions of dollars)

Function	President's requests—			Actual outlays—		
	WED <sup>1</sup>	CBO <sup>2</sup>	OMB <sup>3</sup>	WED	CBO	OMB
<b>Fiscal year 1982:</b>						
National Defense.....	188.9	188.8	186.3	185.3	185.3	185.3
Medicare.....	46.6	47.1	43.2	46.6	46.6	46.6
Social Security.....	159.6	154.7	156.7	156.0	156.0	156.0
Net interest.....	82.6	82.5	68.4	85.0	85.0	85.0
Subtotal.....	477.7	473.2	454.6	472.9	472.9	472.8
Other.....	217.8	221.1	253.6	272.8	255.5	272.9
Total.....	695.5	695.3	708.1	745.7	728.4	745.7
Supplemental *.....	-1.5					
Supplemental total.....	694.0					
<b>Fiscal year 1983:</b>						
National Defense.....	221.1	221.1	220.0	209.9	209.9	209.9
Medicare.....	55.4	55.4	51.0	52.6	52.6	52.6
Social Security.....	173.5	173.5	175.3	170.7	170.7	170.7
Net interest.....	112.5	112.5	97.1	98.8	89.8	89.8
Subtotal.....	562.5	562.5	543.3	523.0	523.0	523.0
Other.....	195.1	195.1	230.1	285.3	273.0	285.3
Total.....	757.6	757.6	773.3	808.3	796.0	808.3
Supplemental.....	+1.5					
Supplemental total.....	759.1					
<b>Fiscal year 1984:</b>						
National Defense.....	245.3	245.3	245.0	227.4	227.4	227.4
Medicare.....	59.8	59.8	59.8	57.5	57.5	57.5
Social Security.....	178.2	178.2	178.9	178.2	178.2	178.2
Net interest.....	103.2	103.2	106.3	111.1	111.1	111.1
Subtotal.....	586.5	586.5	590.0	574.2	574.2	574.2
Other.....	262.0	262.0	273.4	277.6	267.6	277.5
Total.....	848.5	848.5	863.3	851.8	841.8	851.8
Supplemental.....	+3					
Supplemental total.....	848.8					
<b>Fiscal year 1985:</b>						
National Defense.....	272.0	272.0	272.0	252.8	251.5	252.7
Medicare.....	69.7	69.7	69.8	65.8	64.3	65.8
Social Security.....	190.6	190.6	190.6	188.6	190.2	188.6
Net interest.....	116.1	116.1	116.1	129.2	129.4	129.4
Subtotal.....	648.4	648.4	648.7	636.4	635.4	636.6
Other.....	277.1	277.1	291.7	309.6	301.4	309.7
Total.....	925.5	925.5	940.3	946.0	936.8	946.3
Supplemental.....	+1.7					
Supplemental total.....	927.2					
<b>Fiscal year 1986:</b>						
National Defense.....	285.7	285.7	285.7	273.4	273.4	273.4
Medicare.....	67.2	67.2	67.2	70.2	70.2	70.2
Social Security.....	202.2	202.2	202.4	198.8	198.8	198.8
Net interest.....	142.6	142.6	142.6	135.3	136.0	136.0
Subtotal.....	697.7	697.7	607.7	677.7	678.3	678.3
Other.....	276.0	276.0	276.1	312.1	311.6	311.6
Total.....	973.7	973.7	973.9	989.8	989.8	989.8
Supplemental.....	-6.4					
Supplemental total.....	967.3					
<b>Total fiscal year 1982-86:</b>						
National Defense.....	1,213.0	1,212.9	1,209.0	1,148.8	1,147.5	1,148.7
Medicare.....	298.7	299.2	291.0	292.7	291.2	292.7
Social Security.....	904.1	899.2	903.8	892.3	893.9	892.3
Net interest.....	557.0	556.4	530.4	550.4	551.3	551.2
Subtotal.....	2,972.8	2,968.3	2,934.2	2,884.2	2,883.8	2,884.9
Other.....	1,228.0	1,232.3	1,324.8	1,457.4	1,409.1	1,457.0
Total.....	4,200.8	4,200.6	4,259.0	4,341.6	4,292.8	4,341.9
Supplemental.....	-4.5					
Supplemental total.....	4,196.3					
<b>Changes, fiscal year 1982-86:</b>						
National Defense.....	(-64.2)	(-65.4)	(-60.3)			
Medicare.....	(-6.0)	(-8.0)	+1.7			



## WHERE THE MONEY WENT III—THE REAGAN BUDGETS VERSUS ACTUAL SPENDING—Continued

[Outlays in billions of dollars]

Function	President's requests—			Actual outlays—		
	WED <sup>1</sup>	CBO <sup>2</sup>	OMB <sup>3</sup>	WED	CBO	OMB
Social Security	(-11.8)	(-5.3)	(-11.5)			
Net interest	(-6.6)	(-5.6)	+20.8			
Subtotal	(-18.6)	(-10.9)	(-49.3)			
Other	+229.4	+176.8	+132.2			
Total	+140.8	+92.2	+82.9			
(Including supplemental)	(+145.3)					

<sup>1</sup> Representative W.E. Dannemeyer: President's budgets as submitted (FY 1982 Reagan budget submitted in March, 1981); actual outlays as reported.<sup>2</sup> Congressional Budget Office: President's budgets as submitted, excluding off-budget programs (FFB); actual outlays (updated), excluding off-budget programs.<sup>3</sup> Office of Management and Budget: original budget requests adjusted for comparable accounting (national defense includes imputed accruals for military retirement, Medicare includes premiums as offsetting receipts, totals include off-budget outlays).<sup>4</sup> Supplemental totals as net of President's supplemental requests less rescission requests.

Note.—Individual amounts may not equal totals due to rounding. (Prepared by Representative W.E. Dannemeyer, 6-22-87.)

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of illness.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARTON of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SWINDALL, for 60 minutes, on June 24.

Mr. SWINDALL, for 60 minutes, on June 25.

Mr. DREIER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CRAIG, for 60 minutes, on June 30.

Mr. CRAIG, for 60 minutes, on July 7.

Mr. CRAIG, for 60 minutes, on July 14.

Mr. CRANE, for 60 minutes, on June 24.

Mr. MACK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MICA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 5 minutes, today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MOAKLEY, following rollcall No. 204, conference report (H. Con. Res. 86).

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARTON of Texas) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHUMWAY.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

Mr. COURTER.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. GALLO.

Mr. JEFFORDS.

Mr. LUJAN.

Mr. THOMAS of California.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. DAVIS of Michigan.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. DAUB.

Mr. MARLENEE.

Miss SCHNEIDER.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MICA and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. SKELTON in four instances.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. DYSON.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. HOWARD in two instances.

Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. BRYANT.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. SOLARZ.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

Mr. ASPIN in two instances.

Mr. OWENS of New York.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. LANTOS.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2243. An act to designate the Federal Building located at 10 Causeway Street,

Boston, MA, as the "Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Federal Building."

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 191. An act to authorize the establishment of a Peace Garden on a site to be selected by the Secretary of the Interior;

H.R. 2100. An act to designate the border station at 9931 Guide Meridian Road, Lynden, WA, as the "Kenneth G. Ward Border Station";

H.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to designate the third week in June 1987 as "National Dairy Goat Awareness Week"; and

H.J. Res. 178. Joint resolution designating June 25, 1987 as "National Catfish Day."

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 24, 1987, at 10 a.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1646. A letter from the Benefits Administrator, Farm Credit Services, transmitting the annual report of the retirement plan for the employees of the seventh farm credit district, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1647. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting notification of a proposed new Federal records system "prospective Investor System", pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1648. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43

U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1649. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report on the financial statements of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the years ended September 30, 1986 and 1985, and on the Corporation's system of internal accounting controls and on its compliance with laws and regulations (GAO/AFMD-87-43; June 1987), pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9105; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Agriculture.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 207. Resolution waiving certain points of order against consideration of H.R. 2700, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988, and for other purposes (Rept. 100-178). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. A report on the State Department's Siverware Replacement Program: Illegal Procurement Procedures, Weak Internal Controls, and Sloppy Management (Rept. 100-179). Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 2740. A bill to establish the National Dividend Plan by reforming the budget process, and by amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the double tax on dividends, to allocate corporate income tax revenues for payments to qualified registered voters, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Rules.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 2741. A bill to authorize the minting of commemorative coins to support the training of American athletes participating in the 1988 Olympic Games; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 2742. A bill to amend the enforcement provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. COELHO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MFUME, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HOYER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. KOLTER):

H.R. 2743. A bill to revitalize the U.S. steel industry; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DROGUARDI:

H.R. 2744. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require drug testing for individuals to be released on bail, and appropri-

ate conditions of release in the case of those individuals found to be using illegal drugs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2745. A bill to provide for the rescheduling of glutethimide USP into schedule II of the Controlled Substances Act; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

H.R. 2746. A bill to provide for a compilation of States laws relating to illicit drugs; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 2747. A bill to provide grants to States that require recordkeeping of prescription drugs in order to assist in the enforcement of laws against illicit drugs; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 2748. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to use certain lands in connection with the navigation project for Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay, NC; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2749. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the disclosure of returns and return information in the case of cities with a population of more than 250,000 but not more than 2,000,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVINE of California (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FROST, and Miss SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 2750. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that change-of-address order forms submitted to the Postal Service may be furnished to the appropriate State authority for purposes relating to voter registration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. LLOYD:

H.R. 2751. A bill to provide permanent authority to the Department of Energy to indemnify its civilian nuclear energy research and development contractors; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MARLENEE (for himself, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT):

H.R. 2752. A bill to encourage the use of program crop acreage for the purpose of creating game and wildlife habitats, feeding areas, and sanctuaries by protecting farm program crop base acreage and program payment yields; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 2753. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to make necessary improvements in the foster care and adoption assistance program with the objective of assuring that such program will more realistically and more effectively meet the needs of the children involved, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 2754. A bill to provide that certain small reversions of qualified plan assets before the date of the enactment of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 will not be subject to the excise tax on such reversions added by such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2755. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the duty on certain nitrogenous compounds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAWYER:

H.R. 2756. A bill to amend the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact to include the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHULZE:

H.R. 2757. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of portable marine stoves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for him-

self, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LATTI, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 2758. A bill to prevent further erosion of shoreline property by reducing abnormally high water levels on the Great Lakes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SUNDQUIST:

H.R. 2759. A bill to amend title 4 of the United States Code to limit the authorization of any State or political subdivision to tax income of Federal employees who are not residents of such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Mr. ROYBAL):

H.R. 2760. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the program of grants for preventive health services with respect to tuberculosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COURTER:

H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution on the Persian Gulf situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS of Utah (for himself and Mr. CROCKETT):

H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution supporting the initiative of President Oscar Arias Sanchez of Costa Rica to end armed conflict in Central America and encouraging the participation of all regional States in a timely meeting to pursue a negotiated settlement of the conflict in Central America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska (for herself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. BERREUTER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. STANGELAND, and Mr. MARLENEE):

H. Con. Res. 147. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to setting the government ARP level at 27½ percent for the 1988 crop of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H. Res. 208. Resolution to provide that it shall not be in order in the House to consider any measure providing assistance for the Nicaraguan democratic resistance until after the House and Senate Special Select Committees investigating the Iran-Contra matter have filed their final reports; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

139. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to removing the exemption for tobacco and tobacco products from



the Consumer Product Safety Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

140. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to placing tobacco and tobacco products under the Hazardous Substances Control Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

141. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to requiring tobacco companies to reveal the ingredients put into cigarettes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

142. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to placing tobacco and tobacco products under the Toxic Substances Control Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

143. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. PICKETT, Mr. DIXON, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 21: Mr. DIXON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 80: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 134: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 509: Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 537: Mr. WEBER.

H.R. 588: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KEMP, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HILER, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 592: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. HOPKINS, and Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 722: Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 792: Mr. COBLE and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 898: Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 925: Mr. ROE and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 940: Mr. PICKLE, Mr. CLARKE, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 954: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan.

H.R. 1032: Mr. MORRISON of Washington and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 1049: Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 1097: Mr. ANDERSON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COATS, Mr. DYSON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. OLIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.R. 1119: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1140: Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 1173: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1196: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. STRATTON, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 1234: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 1364: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 1398: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1467: Mr. St GERMAIN, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 1481: Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 1544: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1546: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1601: Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 1624: Mrs. BYRON.

H.R. 1638: Mr. AKAKA and Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.R. 1675: Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 1707: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 1722: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 1723: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 1770: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1782: Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 1786: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1841: Mr. BONKER.

H.R. 1950: Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 1955: Mr. BROOMFIELD and Mr. PURSELL.

H.R. 2047: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. NEAL, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2052: Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. NAGLE, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 2114: Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 2116: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 2148: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. GRANT, Mr. ECKART, and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 2240: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 2241: Mr. DEWINE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 2248: Mr. LOTT, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 2249: Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 2259: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 2276: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 2320: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 2327: Mr. UDALL, Mr. ROSE, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 2328: Mr. BALLENGER and Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 2405: Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MFUME, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SOLARZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LELAND, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WILSON, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. COELHO.

H.R. 2435: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 2456: Mr. WEISS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. LANCASTER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 2482: Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 2491: Mr. ECKART and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 2538: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, and Mrs. SAIKI.

H.R. 2546: Mr. WILSON and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 2556: Mr. BUECHNER and Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 2565: Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. DYSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 2567: Mr. KANYORSKI.

H.R. 2579: Mr. ECKART, Mr. GREGG, Mr. COATS, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 2584: Mr. ATKINS and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 2589: Mrs. BOGGS.

H.R. 2599: Mr. HOWARD.

H.R. 2610: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 2611: Mr. GALLO, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. LATTI, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2634: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. HAWKINS.

H.R. 2635: Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 2642: Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 2644: Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. BLAZ, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 2662: Mr. SUNQUIST.

H.R. 2687: Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 2692: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. COURTER, and Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 2729: Mr. SAXTON.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. LATTI.

H.J. Res. 25: Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.J. Res. 114: Mr. COELHO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. MICHEL.

H.J. Res. 130: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. COURTER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. SABO, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WALGREEN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. STARK, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.J. Res. 228: Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. WELDON, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. CARPER, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.J. Res. 255: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. OLIN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. KANYORSKI, Mr. STUMP, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. MACKEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BARNARD, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.J. Res. 266: Mr. MCDADE, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. KEMP, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. MARTIN of New York, and Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania.

H.J. Res. 271: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. HAWKINS.

H.J. Res. 272: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 302: Mr. PACKARD, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. OLIN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LOTT, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. GEPHARDT.

H.J. Res. 304: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. STARK, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. LEACH of Iowa.

H.J. Res. 309: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.J. Res. 311: Mr. OWENS of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. STOKES.

H.J. Res. 313: Mr. HATCHER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.J. Res. 314: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. GALLO, Mr. KEMP, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MOODY, Mr. HALL of

Ohio, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MANTON, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MRAZEK, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. YATES, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. DAUB, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. VOLKMER and Mr. HORTON.

H.J. Res. 321: Mr. FISH.

H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. BORSKI.

H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. LUJAN.

H. Con. Res. 112: Mr. COURTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida and Mr. LUNGREN.

H. Con. Res. 118: Mr. TORRES.

H. Con. Res. 120: Mr. FISH, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. MFUME.

H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. JONTZ.

H. Con. Res. 139: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. TALLON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. SUNDQUIST and Mr. HOLLOWAY.

H. Res. 188: Mr. STOKES, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. STUMP, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LIGHTFOOT and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H. Res. 194: Mr. FRANK, Mr. PENNY, Mr. APPEGATE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

#### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2700,

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire:  
—Page 39, strike lines 7 through 20.